

JUDICIAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

DEC. 31 1930

VOL. LI, 4

WHOLE No. 204

THE

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK, WILFRED P. MUSTARD,
D. M. ROBINSON

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER

1930

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under
the Act of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October
3, 1917. Authorized on July 8, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	<small>PAGE</small>
Roman Census Statistics from 508 to 225 B. C. By TENNEY FRANK,	313
Vergil and Pollio. By HAROLD BENNETT,	325
Particularism in the Roman Empire during the Military Anarchy. By C. E. VAN SICKLE,	343
A New Method of Investigating the Caesura in Latin Hexameter and Pentameter. By PHILIP B. WHITEHEAD,	358
Medea's Waxing Wrath. By J. E. HARRY,	372
The Text of Two Sources for Campanian Topography. By A. W. VAN BUREN,	378
REPORTS:	382
Mnemosyne, Vol. LVIII (1929), 1-2 (CLAYTON M. HALL).— Romania, Vol. LIV (1928), juillet-octobre (GEORGE C. KEIDEL).—Glotta, Vol. XIX (1930), 1-2 (ROLAND G. KENT).	
REVIEWS:	389
<i>Leon Herrmann's</i> Les Masques et les Visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile (W. P. MUSTARD).— <i>J. F. Mount- ford and J. T. Schultz's</i> Index Rerum et Nominum in Scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati Tractatorum (ID.).— <i>Augusto Rostagni's</i> Arte Poetica di Orazio (ID.).— <i>Vincenzo Ussani's</i> Storia della Letteratura Latina nelle Eta Repubblicana e Augustea (ID.).— <i>Anna Cox Brin- ton's</i> Maphaeus Vegius and his Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid (ID.).— <i>Anna Cox Brinton's</i> Descensus Averno (ID.).— <i>Louis Hastings Naylor's</i> Chateaubriand and Virgil (ID.).— <i>George B. Ives's</i> The Essays of Montaigne (GEORGE BOAS).— <i>Franciscus Novotny's</i> Platonis Epis- tulae Commentariis Illustratae (L. A. POST).— <i>Julius Jüthner's</i> Körperfiklatur im Altertum (WALTER WOOD- BURN HYDE).	
BOOKS RECEIVED,	398
INDEX,	401

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 25 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.





AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LI, 4

WHOLE No. 204

ROMAN CENSUS STATISTICS FROM 508 TO 225 B.C.

[Before 332 B.C. the Roman census apparently included all *capita libera*, whereas in the third century it included only adult males. With this understanding the figures for the period 508-225 B.C. prove to be in agreement with established historical data.]

A few years ago¹ I discussed the Roman census statistics for the years 225-28 B.C., reaching the conclusion that they were essentially reliable and that all of them—the Augustan as well as the Republican figures—pointed to a uniform system of enumerating only the adult male citizens. Here it is my intention to discuss the earlier statistics for the years 508-225 B.C. My conclusion in this essay is that the lists from 508 to 225 are also in the main correct; that, however, the census down to the formation of the great Latin federation in 339 was a complete counting of all free inhabitants (*capita libera*, Pliny, *H. N.* 33, 16), whereas the new system of counting which we find in vogue in 225 B.C. included only adult males, and was introduced soon after 339, when Rome incorporated a large number of Latin, Auruncan, and Campanian cities.

The earlier census figures for the fifth century are usually rejected as unreliable. They have frequently been collected and are as follows:²

¹ *Class. Phil.* 1924, 329-341.

² See especially Herzog, *Comm. in Honorem Mommseni*, 124, and Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.* 1926, p. 216. The census figure for 498 (from Dionysius) is so large that we must either suppose that it is erroneous or that Rome succeeded temporarily during the early struggle with the Etruscans in incorporating some of the Latin towns. In that case Rome must have lost these towns again before the Cassian treaty was made in 493. I have not considered the item given by Fabius and Livy

508 B. C.	130,000	(Dion. Hal. V, 20, Plut. <i>Publ.</i> 12)
503 B. C.	120,000	(Hieron. <i>Ol.</i> 69, 1)
498 B. C.	150,700	(Dion. V, 75)
493 B. C.	110,000	(Dion. VI, 96)
474 B. C.	103,000	(Dion. IX, 36)
465 B. C.	104,714	(Livy III, 3, 9)
459 B. C.	117,319	(Livy III, 24, Eutr. 1, 16)
392 B. C.	152,573 ^a	(<i>capita libera</i> , Plin. <i>H. N.</i> 33, 16)

Of these figures Beloch (who assumes that only males over 17 were counted) says: "Dass diese Zahlen masslos übertrieben sind, liegt auf der Hand und wird heute von keinem Verständigen mehr bestritten."⁴ However, if Beloch had considered that these early figures included *all capita libera*⁵ as Pliny indicates in *H. N.* 33, 16, whereas the later figures include only adult males, he would hardly have spoken so adversely, for he

(I, 44) for the time of Servius (80,000), since I doubt very much whether any records were preserved from the regal period. But the figure may be correct.

^a The growth during the sixty-seven years after 459 is thirty per cent, which seems a fairly normal increase for that time. There could hardly have been any increase during the long war with Veii. The census was taken before the new tribes were formed north of the Tiber in 387 B. C.

⁴ Cf. E. Meyer, *Bevölkerungswesen*, in Conrad's *Handwörterbuch*,³ II, 906: "Keinen historischen Wert."

⁵ Pliny, *H. N.* 33, 16, in giving the number for 392 B. C. says that it represented the complete free population (*capita libera*). This statement of Pliny is usually disregarded because Livy (I, 44) quotes Fabius as saying that the early census was one of *eorum qui arma ferre possent*. However, the two witnesses are not on a par. Fabius merely accepts the system that is customary in his own day and projects that into the past; while Pliny does not. It seems to me that Pliny must have some good ground for rejecting the traditional assumption. It is sometimes said that the ancient census was interested only in warriors, but the Pharaohs kept complete population lists in the seventh century B. C., and this method was still used in Egypt under the Ptolemies (Diod. 17, 52). The Romans, in fact, continued even after 332 to keep full records, though the censors thereafter published only the numbers needed for military and voting purposes. Cicero, in *De Leg.* III, 7, makes it clear that the Republican censors recorded the *suboles* and *familias* as well as the adult males, which is doubtless a survival of the old system. Rome's censorial institution is so remarkable that inferences drawn from Greek or Mesopotamian customs are of no value regarding its scope.

goes on to say that: "Daran kann kein Zweifel sein dass Latium schon früh eine verhältnismässig dichte Bevölkerung gehabt hat" (p. 217). When we consider that the city walls enclosed more than a square mile⁶ (an area usually reckoned as holding 100,000 inhabitants under the conditions of that day) and that Rome's ager had about 300 square miles of arable land (Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.* 216) which, under hoe-culture, would require the labor of at least 40,000 workers,⁷ we realize that the figures, if they represent the whole free population, are remarkably appropriate.

The surprising thing about these numbers is that during the first thirty years of the Republic they diminish from 130,000 to 103,000, that is, somewhat over 20 per cent in thirty years. It is difficult to understand what Roman inventor of statistics would have been clever enough to think of assuming such a decline. It is only recently, after the excavations of Rome revealed to us the temporary decay of the early republican city, that we learned that a decided diminution must have taken place. We now know that Tarquin's city was prosperous, and had a large population busy at buildings and at commerce. We have just learned to read the first Carthaginian treaty in the light of

⁶ Rome's area within the "city of the four regions" (under the kings) was over 700 acres; after the Aventine was added in the fourth century, it was about 1075 acres (Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.* 213). A part of the Aventine was settled in the fifth century. The walls of Etruscan cities enclosed the following areas: Caere, 300 acres; Volterra, 325; Tarquinii, 375; Volci, 450; Veii, over 500. Tarentum was the only city of Italy that had a larger area. Capua had about 450 acres in 225 B. C., when the Campanian praefecture furnished 34,000 young men capable of bearing arms (Livy 23, 5). At least a half belonged to Capua, and the urban population of that city is reckoned by De Sanctis (II, 494) at about 70,000.

⁷ Even during the second century, in the six citizen colonies of 184-1 sent out under Cato's advice, the colonists received on the average only some four and one-half acres each. They are the following (Livy 39, 29; 40, 44-55):

184 Potentia	6 jugera (four acres)	2000 colonists
184 Pisaurum	6 jugera	2000 colonists
183 Mutina	5 jugera	number not given
183 Parma	8 jugera	number not given
183 Saturnia	10 jugera	number not given
181 Graviscae	5 jugera	number not given

that fact,⁸ and to realize that the terms of the Latin treaty of 493 provide definite evidence that Rome was suffering a serious decline after the expulsion of the kings. These census figures give us the very same impression that we have recently obtained from the condition of early Roman architecture and art, from the decay of the early Latin villages and of agrarian works,⁹ from the disappearance of Attic ware from Latium in the fifth century, from the recent re-examination of the wars in Latium and of the Cassian Treaty. It is very doubtful whether any annalist of the second or first century B. C. was aware that these were the conditions in the early Republic. The statistics apparently came from the records that were kept from early times by the censors, or from copies of them that were preserved in the *libri lintei ad Monetae*.¹⁰ Historians have long admired the Roman institution of the censorship. Apparently it took over a system that was well organized even before the year 443.

Now, if these were the true census figures of the *capita libera*, they ought to fit in with the requirements of the "Servian" classification which seems to belong to the fifth century. It has been customary, of course, to attribute the "Servian" reorganization to the period of the Latin War¹¹ because the 193 centuries seem too many to fit into the population of an earlier day. The strong objection to a late dating is that it brings the reorganization down to a period of democratic victories, whereas the "Servian" classification implies a highly aristocratic régime in

⁸ I tried to present the facts in my *Economic History of Rome*, 1920, pp. 27 ff. E. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*,² II, 295 ff. (1924), and H. Last, in *Cambridge Anc. Hist.*, VII, pp. 859 ff., have reached similar conclusions.

⁹ Frank, *Econ. Hist.* 1920, pp. 6 ff. Excellent terra-cotta revetments of about 540-480 B. C. have been found from some fifteen buildings of importance at Rome (Mrs. Van Buren, *Figurative Terra-cotta Revetments in Etruria and Latium*). For the later fifth century they are very rare. The building activity begun under the Tarquins gradually died during the twenty-five years after their expulsion (*Memoirs Am. Acad.* V, 102, and Scott, *ibid.* VII, 95 ff.).

¹⁰ It is worthy of note that Licinius Macer found much remarkable material in the *libri lintei*, especially for the few years following the establishment of the censorship. See Münzer on *Licinius Macer* in *Pauly-Wissowa*.

¹¹ So, for example, Rosenberg, *Stud. z. röm. Zenturienverfassung*, 1911, p. 21 and Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.*, p. 287.

that it assigns control of the assembly to the first class and the knights. Whether or not a Servius Tullius had previously shaped the main outline of a centuriate organization does not concern us here. The document that Polybius and Livy knew must, of course, date from a time when records were being kept. Professor Nilsson¹² has recently pointed out that the reform of the constitution in 444 B. C. which imposed *tribuni militum consulari potestate* in the place of consuls was most likely the event that introduced the Greek-Etruscan hoplite army, and that, in the year following (443), the first censors appear. This is then the likeliest year for the whole reorganization of the army and of the centuriate comitia. Now, with but slight variation between Livy, Dionysius, and Cicero, the classification stood thus:¹³

18 centuries of knights (1800 men)
80 centuries, 1st class (8000), property, 100,000 asses (= 40,000 H S)
20 centuries, 2nd class (2000), property, 75,000 asses (= 30,000 H S)
20 centuries, 3rd class (2000), property, 50,000 asses (= 20,000 H S)
20 centuries, 4th class (2000), property, 25,000 asses (= 10,000 H S)
30 centuries, 5th class (3000), property, 12,500 asses (= 5,000 H S)
5 centuries of fabri, musicians, and supernumeraries

For the army these figures provide two active legions of 4200 infantry and 300 cavalry, the same number of seniores for the defensive troops, armed to protect Rome, a reserve corps of cavalry for two legions and then five centuries of fabri, etc. The total provides for nearly 20,000 men, all but three centuries being property holders. This implies a population of about 60,000 persons who belonged to the property-holding class that was connected with the members of the centuries,¹⁴ or, perhaps,

¹² Nilsson in *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, 1929, p. 4; this is a very illuminating discussion.

¹³ Polybius, VI, 23, who equates drachmas with denarii, indicates that the classification was still practically unchanged in his day (about 150 B. C.), for the first-class requirement was still 10,000 drachmas. However, the fifth class then had a requirement of only 400 denarii (*ibid.* 19).

¹⁴ Dionysius, IX, 25, considers that one ought to multiply the census list of *civium capita* by four to get a fair estimate of the whole population (including women, children, slaves, etc.). Since slaves were few in the early days, I should multiply by three.

80,000 or 90,000, if we make liberal allowance for adult males not wholly fit for army service. Is 20,000 an unreasonable number of property-holders for a population of 125,000 in the year 444, that is, fifteen years after the population of 117,000 recorded for 459?

Rosenberg¹⁵ insists that in modern times the very poor outnumber the well-to-do and that one must therefore assume a later day for the reform so that one may reckon with a larger population. However, the conditions that obtain in the modern industrial cities of Europe do not represent the conditions of early Latium where farming was the chief occupation and where one man could not care for more than a few acres of land. Even in the colonization of the second century B. C. the average assignment was only six and a half jugera (a trifle over four acres). In our newer settlements of America a decided majority of citizens are property owners and the farms are fairly uniform in size. Rosenberg's illustrations drawn from modern Germany, Belgium, and Holland are not apposite. If the population of Rome (urban and rural) was about 125,000 in 444, an active army of two legions of property holders¹⁶ and a defensive force of two legions of seniores would require an effective propertied population of 60,000, and still have 65,000 for the proletariat, the ineffective and possible reserves. It therefore seems to me that the census figures square well with an early date for the "Servian" constitution.

I believe the figures for the property qualifications of each class are equally reasonable. The sums set down for each class are reckoned according to the currency of the third century after the denarius and the sestertius had been adopted. But, since the whole centuriate system was aristocratic and in this respect remained unchanged in the third century, it is likely that the property values also were left unchanged and were merely equated with the old by a careful substitution of the new standard of values. The sums, in the coinage of 268, are

¹⁵ Op. cit. pp. 23 ff.

¹⁶ As E. Meyer says in the *Handwörterbuch*, p. 908, during the Hannibalic war about ten per cent of the population of Rome was under arms for several years; at that time, furthermore, most of the soldiers of the twenty legions were *juniiores*.

40,000, 30,000, 20,000, 10,000, and 5,000 sesterces respectively. What sums, reckoned in copper, cattle, or land, these figures actually represent we unfortunately do not know. We know that the value of copper, sheep, and oxen fluctuated considerably from time to time. In 452 cattle were relatively so cheap that in paying fines¹⁷ an ox counted for only 100 lbs. of bronze and a sheep for 10. We have no prices of land for the period, but we can reckon out the probable price of wheat in the period of Polybius. He says,¹⁸ for instance, that knights in the army were given 120 sesterces each month (16 asses per day) and that they were expected to buy out of this 12 modii of wheat, and 42 modii of barley. As barley usually sold for about two-thirds the price of wheat, the wheat seems to have been reckoned at three sesterces the modius (3 denarii the bushel) and barley at two-thirds of this; that is to say, grain had about the same average price in his day as in Cicero's. Hence, when Polybius wrote, the 10,000 drachmas (denarii) of the first class would be worth about 3,333 bushels of wheat, and the other classes would have property equal, respectively, to 2500, 1666, 833, 416 bushels of wheat. And since, in the reform of the currency in the third century, equivalence of property was apparently kept, we may fairly assume that these amounts of wheat will approximately represent the relative property qualifications of the five classes when the army was reformed in 444.

Of course, the original sums had probably been expressed in pounds of bronze or jugera of land or heads of cattle, but we have not the data by which to attempt a conversion of our statistics into the corresponding values of these commodities. By using wheat instead, we can equally well picture to ourselves the values involved. And we need not imagine wheat as very scarce or very valuable; wheat was at that time the staple product of Latium and fairly plentiful. It probably was not worth more in relation to ordinary commodities than in Cicero's day when a bushel exchanged for three denarii of silver. At a loose reckoning, with one eye upon comparative prices in Greece, we may assume that a citizen who owned twenty jugera (13 acres) of land with an adobe house, a few sheep and cattle, and a year's crop of wheat (say 160 bushels), would qualify for the first class.

¹⁷ By the *lex Aternia-Tarpeia*.

¹⁸ *Pol. VI*, 39.

That is a small property to be sure, but, in making up an army in which half of the soldiers must belong to the class that provided their own armor and stood in the first line, it was not desirable to place the qualifications too high. It is also very likely, as Mommsen assumed, that the fifth class included those who had only the traditional heredium of two jugera (one and a half acres) with a hut and meager appurtenances. And we may also suppose that the list was drawn up at a time when the figures 80, 20, 20, 20, 30, represented approximately the actual ratios of the citizens in each class. It would then indicate that property was fairly well distributed.

Since the qualifications were so simple, we are not compelled to face the old question of how the property of 9,800 men of the first class could be found in the area of fifth-century Rome and its ager. A city that had over a square mile of habitations within its walls and that possessed three hundred square miles of arable land would readily provide the property qualifications required, if the values were anything like those that our scanty statistics imply. I therefore think that the census statistics of the first century of the Republic are entirely credible, if, with Nilsson, we date the "Servian" classification about the year 444 B. C. So much for the census list of the fifth century.

For the fourth century the census statistics are very meager. We have only the following items left:

392 B. C.	152,573	(Pliny, <i>H. N.</i> , 33, 16, <i>capita libera</i>)
339 B. C.	165,000	(Euseb. <i>Ol.</i> 110, 1; Hier. 110, 1, says 160,000)
circa 323 B. C.	250,000	(Livy 9, 19)
293 B. C.	262,321	(Livy 10, 47)

The first two items are reasonable enough. The first one, which comes sixty-seven years after the last one given for the fifth century, shows an increase of about 35,000 souls, that is an increase of about 30 per cent in 67 years. After 392 the newly conquered Veientine lands (Livy 5, 30, 8) were distributed partly to plebeians (already counted), and partly to Veientines who had deserted their city (Livy 6, 4, 4). These four new tribes probably did not increase Rome's citizenship very considerably. In 358 two new tribes were also added in southern Latium (Pomptina and Publilia), but here again the citizens

of Rome probably were used to a large extent. On the other hand Rome had suffered very severely when the Gauls took the city, as is proved by the sudden revolt of several Latin cities. Hence the small increase of population up to 339 is again what one would expect.

About 339, however, Rome began to expand very rapidly. The Latin war was ending and the senate decided on the advice of Camillus (if we may believe Livy) to employ a prudent liberality toward the revolting allies and extend the franchise as far as possible. Citizenship was given outright to Aricia, Lobicum, Lanuvium, the Laurentes, Nomentum, Pedum, and probably to Tusculum. The citizens of Antium were allowed to enroll in the citizen colony. Rome's area was thereby more than doubled. Furthermore, half citizenship was granted to Fundi, Formiae, and apparently to Satricum and Velitrae. Two tribes of ex-Latins, the Scaptia and Maecia, were formed in 332 when the censors made the new count. But the greatest addition was made in Campania where the inhabitants of Capua, Cumae (Vell. 1, 14; Livy 8, 14), and Acerrae (Livy 8, 17) were added to the list of half citizens. Since Capua could provide 34,000 young fighting men in 225, when she was less prosperous than before, we can hardly reckon on a population of less than 200,000 souls for the new Campanian addition. The territory of Rome had spread from Lake Bracciano to Naples during the century; it had, in fact, increased from about 300 square miles to nearly 2400 square miles.¹⁹

Of course, we cannot admit that an increase of only 60 per cent in population adequately corresponds to an increase of 800 per cent in area, when Campania alone added some 200,000 souls. We must assume that the new method of counting which was employed during the next century was adopted between the census of 339 and that of 323.²⁰ The census of 392 included all *capita libera*, if Pliny is right, and that of 339 must have been made on the same basis. But with the addition to the

¹⁹ I do not include the Latin allied towns and colonies that lay enclosed within the various parts of the ager.

²⁰ The precise date of this census is not recorded; Livy, in giving the number as about 250,000, says only that the census was about the time of Alexander's death (Livy IX, 19).

state of most of the Latins, Volscians, Auruncans, and Campanians, the senate was no longer interested in full population figures. What it needed was a list of the effective fighting men in the newly added cities. Moreover, the censors could hardly expect men to take their families up to Rome for registration from distant cities like Capua. It was doubtless in making the first great census of all these new peoples in 332 that the new formula was used. And though every man who came before the censor still had to report the names of his *familia*, so that a record of *capita libera* was available, the item that interested the consuls during the period of heavy fighting which followed was the list of adult males. Hence I take it that Livy's number of 250,000 for about 323 is the census of adult males, full and half citizens, of the vast area extending from the northern boundary of Veii down to Naples.

That this number is not unreasonable is proved by the fact that during the next century the authentic and generally accepted figures vary between about 250,000 and 290,000 of adult males. This was a century during which there were heavy losses in wars and the only new peoples incorporated were of mountain village folk, the Aequi and Sabines. The 250,000 adult males of 323 would represent a free population—there were relatively few slaves as yet—of about 800,000 souls. When we consider that it included the two prosperous cities of Rome and Capua, a dozen cities of fair size, and two fertile areas, Campania and Latium, which were farmed intensively with hand tools, we must grant that Livy's statistics are reasonable.

The statistics for the adult male citizens of the third century B. C. down to 233 are as follows:

293 B. C.	262,321	(Livy. X, 47)
289-7 B. C.	272,000	(Livy <i>Epit.</i> 11)
279 B. C.	287,222	(Livy <i>Epit.</i> 13)
275 B. C.	271,224	(Livy <i>Epit.</i> 14)
264 B. C.	292,234	(Livy <i>Epit.</i> 16, emended on Eutr. II, 18)
251 B. C.	297,797	(Livy <i>Epit.</i> 18)
246 B. C.	241,712	(Livy <i>Epit.</i> 19)
240 B. C.	260,000	(Hier. <i>Ol.</i> 134, 1)
233 B. C.	270,713	(Livy <i>Epit.</i> 20)

Most of these figures show a reasonable correspondence with historical events, for instance, the slow increase up to 293

through a period of heavy fighting, then the losses of the Pyrrhic war after 279, and again the increase during the period of peace which followed. There is also a large decrease recorded during the First Punic War though our figures show a temporary rise in 251 after the loss of Regulus' army. Either the epitome of Livy has an error here or Rome made an unusual effort at the time to bring in slackers. The number for 246 indicates a decrease of over 50,000 for the First Punic War—which is about what we should expect from the record of losses kept by Polybius. The increase of about 18,000 in 240 is accounted for by the formation of two new tribus in 241, the Quirina and the Velina. The total of 260,000 accords well with the number 270,713 for 233, which has never been questioned since it checks with the famous muster rolls of 225 preserved by Polybius.

In short, therefore, I find the census statistics from 508 to 225 generally acceptable in that they accord well with what we know of conditions at Rome, of the "Servian" constitution, and of political history. However, we must accept Pliny's statement that the census figure which he happens to quote for 392 gives the number of *all capita libera*, and consider that that represents the early system of counting. The new system of counting only those *qui arma ferre possent* was apparently instituted in 332 when Rome incorporated large numbers of Latins, Volscians, Auruncans, and Campanians in the city-state.

Trained as our generation was at an early date to read Roman history as it was presented by Pais, we have some difficulty in accepting such conservative conclusions. Yet I do not see how to avoid them. If they are correct, we have one more proof that good records did exist in the fifth century, and why not? Livy supposed that the Gauls destroyed most of Rome, but he assumes time and again that the temples (in which the records were kept) were spared (V, 49, 3; 50, 2), and the remnants of the older buildings clearly prove that the Gauls spared most of them, presumably from superstitious fear. Most historians are now very much more respectful of the consular lists of the fifth century, of the religious records, of the colonial dates, of the quotations from laws, treaties, and the twelve tables than they were twenty-five years ago. Quite recently, Eduard Meyer expressed his faith in the essential accuracy of the early *Fasti* in

his usual vigorous manner:²¹ "Dass in Rom so gut wie in allen anderen Republiken oder in Assur eine authentische Liste der eponymen Jahresbeamten sowohl für das geschäftliche wie für das öffentliche Leben ganz unentbehrlich war, is selbstverständlich." And it is equally self-evident that the leading magistrates, priests, and senators of Rome would need private copies written on wax tablets or linen of such documents as were indispensable for their work. Even if the Gauls made havoc of the records within those temples, it is difficult to imagine that some statesmen of the day would not have saved their own copies. Livy says explicitly that after the departure of the Gauls a serious effort was made to restore the public documents (*foedera et leges*, VI, 1, 10), and we have more and more reason to believe that the restoration was based upon fairly good evidence. Of course, the few and scanty sentences preserved were not always understood by later historians, and a mass of unreliable traditions regarding campaigns and speeches later came to be used in order to adorn the waste spaces between recorded facts, but we seem to be reaching the conclusion that the kernel of early republican history comes from authentic, if meager, records.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

²¹ *Kleine Schriften*², p. 302. The wholesale rejection of names in the early *Fasti* because four centuries later they were borne only by plebeians is an unscientific procedure. Every patrician of the early Republic was likely to have plebeian freedmen bearing his name, and since patrician families died out rapidly in historical times, there is no reason to assume that all of the early ones survived. At Rome where manumission and the adoption of the patron's gentile name had always been in vogue, patricians and plebeians must have borne the same gentile name in very many instances.

VERGIL AND POLLIO.

[Trustworthy historical notices make it possible to reconstruct a fairly satisfactory account of Pollio's relation to men and events in the period 43-39 B.C. Since his patronage of Vergil clearly falls within these dates, we have in the historical Pollio a valuable criterion for testing the confused and inconsistent historical statements of the ancient commentators on the *Bucolics*. The present article emphasizes the importance of this criterion for judging such questions as: the circumstances of the Mantuan land confiscation and Vergil's exemption; the identity of the child of the fourth Eclogue; the order of composition of the Eclogues.]

One can not study the commentary of Servius on the *Bucolics* without being impressed with the amazing inaccuracy of many of the comments on matters historical. That Servius had at his disposal historical sources, more numerous and possibly more reliable than those now in existence, is beyond question, but such use as he made of them must have been uncritical, and even unintelligent. His naive suggestion that "Augustus" was unable to help Vergil when his land was threatened, because he was "occupied with the warfare at Actium"¹ reveals a hopeless lack of historical perspective, while his statement that Pollio was made consul after he had triumphed over Dalmatia² betrays a neglect to consult even the most accessible of all Roman historical records, the *Fasti*. This historical unreliability of Servius, which extends also to the other commentators on the *Bucolics*,³ has left us with a very confused, and often inconsistent, account of the historical background of certain of Vergil's Eclogues, particularly in connection with the part which Pollio played as the poet's patron. Did Pollio, either alone or in conjunction with others, exempt Vergil's land from the Mantuan confiscations? Did he intercede with Octavian on behalf of Vergil and get the lands restored? Or was it Gallus who introduced the poet to Octavian's favor? Was the fourth Eclogue written in honor of Pollio, or Octavian, or both, or neither? These are questions which have been much debated

¹ Serv. on *Ecl.* IX 11; IX 67.

² Serv. on *Ecl.* III 88; IV 1.

³ For a discussion of the methods of the commentators see Prof. Frank's article in *Eranos* XXI (1923) 1 ff.

among scholars, and many different conclusions have been reached. The purpose of the present article is not so much to attempt any new solution as to set up one definite criterion by which the conflicting evidence of the commentators may be tested. This criterion is the historical Pollio.

In the turbulent politics of the last half-century B. C., C. Asinius Pollio played a sufficiently important rôle to receive considerable mention in the historical records of the period. He himself was a historian of parts, and wrote an account of the civil wars, which, though not extant, undoubtedly served as a source for other writers whose work has survived, notably Velleius Paterculus and Appian. From his own hand we possess three letters, written to Cicero in 43 B. C., when the fate of Octavian and Antony rested mainly upon the decision of the governors of the Western provinces, of whom Pollio was one. Some important evidence of his political color is also to be found in the work of his contemporary, the elder Seneca. If, therefore, by a review of this evidence, we can arrive at a reasonably clear understanding of Pollio's character and political affiliations, it seems entirely proper that we should use this as a criterion to test the dubious assertions of the commentators on Vergil.

The military career of Pollio in the cause of Julius Caesar is well known and strongly attested. From the crossing of the Rubicon until the victory at Munda, he was almost constantly in arms, either with Caesar or in Caesar's service. At the end of 45 B. C. he was rewarded with the praetorship,⁴ and for the following year was sent to Spain as governor of the Farther province,⁵ where he was still engaged in fighting Caesar's enemies⁶ at the time of the dictator's death.

During all this period Pollio rendered loyal service not to the *cause*, but to the *man*. At the approach of civil war, finding himself unable to remain neutral, as he would have wished, he chose Caesar in self-interest rather than from political preference.⁷ Welcomed and honored, however, by Caesar, to whom

⁴ Along with eleven others. Vell. II 73, 2. Dio XLIII 47, 2.

⁵ App. IV 84. Cic. *ad Fam.* X 31, 4.

⁶ Under Sextus Pompeius. Vell. II 63, 3; 73, 2; 86, 3; 128, 3.

⁷ Cic. *ad Fam.* X 31, 2. Cum vero non liceret mihi nullius partis esse, quia utrobique magnos inimicos habebam, ea castra fugi, in quibus

literary talent was always a strong recommendation,⁸ and received into personal friendship, Pollio gave in return his undivided loyalty and affection.⁹

“Dilexi summa pietate et fide.” This statement made to *Cicero*, in 43 B. C., in a letter in which Pollio is protesting devotion to republicanism, rings with the fervor of a real affection. The writer is no doubt sincere in declaring his uncompromising opposition to tyranny, but by his own confession he stands convicted of having loved the tyrant.

This characteristic of the man, his high loyalty to friendship, is the keynote also in the next period of his life. In 44-43 B. C., in the turmoil which followed that “most senseless deed that was ever done”, Roman leaders in public life were once more called upon to take sides in a quarrel which could be settled only by civil war. Pollio’s decision was now a matter of some consequence. He was a holder of *imperium*, with three legions under his command.¹⁰ That he did nothing for a year and a half has been thought by some¹¹ to mean that he played a waiting game, seeking to maintain neutrality until the issue should have been decided. At first reading, his letters to *Cicero*¹² do give this impression. He professes himself loyal to the republic and willing to face any danger for the defence of liberty, but finds all manner of excuses for not stirring from his province. He had not had the remotest suspicion until after his legions had been put into winter quarters that there would be civil insurrection; he had not written to Rome during the winter because the land routes were unsafe for letter carriers, and he had had to wait for the sailing season; it would be

plane tutum me ab insidiis inimici sciebam non futurum; compulsus eo, quo minime volebam, ne in extremis essem, plane pericula non dubitanter adii.

⁸ It is very likely that Pollio went to Caesar’s camp on Caesar’s invitation. He evidently had connections with the *Novi Poetae*, whose literary support Caesar made determined efforts to win. See Frank, *A.J.P.* XL 396 ff.

⁹ Cic. *ad Fam.* X 31, 2. Caesarem vero, quod me in tanta fortuna modo cognitum vetustissimorum familiarium loco habuit, dilexi summa cum pietate et fide. Cf. Mendell, *Yale Class. Stud.* I 196-7.

¹⁰ Cic. *ad Fam.* X 32, 4.

¹¹ See Drumann-Groebel, II² p. 6.

¹² *ad Fam.* X 31, 32, 33.

impossible for him to bring his legions through the province of Lepidus without the latter's consent, and Lepidus had already been soliciting the legions for Antony; he had feared to come to Italy because if he should have arrived too late for the battle his patriotic intentions would have been misinterpreted; finally (frequently reiterated), the senate has sent him no instructions.¹³ The real reason, however, for Pollio's inaction was his friendship for Antony.¹⁴ And the reason that Cicero and his senatorial government sent him no orders was that they knew he was the friend of Antony, and felt that he could not be trusted to take the field against his friend.¹⁵ Whether they were right in this judgment can never be conclusively decided. Certainly Pollio did finally throw in his lot with Antony, and brought with him also the wavering Plancus and his legions;¹⁶ but this was only after the decrees against Antony had been revoked at the instance of Octavian, as consul, and there was no longer any conflict between duty and friendship.

We may feel sure, however, that Pollio's rapprochement was with his friend, Antony, rather than with the triumvirate as a whole. This is shown by the fact that Antony put him in charge of that part of his triumviral spoils which he was most anxious to keep safe for himself from all rivals. He made Pollio his legate in Cisalpine Gaul and gave him seven legions with which to hold it.¹⁷ This province had been the bone of contention between Antony and the Senate. Its value as a base of operations against Italy had been demonstrated by Julius Caesar, and in the years following his death none of the rival factions was under any misapprehension as to its strategic importance.¹⁸ Antony schemed and fought to obtain it, and when

¹³ J. van Wageningen (*Mnemosyne* XLVII, 1919, pp. 77-83) argues that Pollio joined Antony because his pride was hurt at the treatment accorded him by the senate. This does not account for Pollio's numerous excuses, nor does it explain *why* the senate treated him with neglect.

¹⁴ *ad Fam.* X 33, 2: *propter amicitiam quae mihi cum Antonio . . . fuit.* Süpfle's idea that Pollio was referring to Antony in *ad Fam.* X 30, 2, has been generally discredited. The allusion is obviously to some person who is in a position to hold conversation with Pollio; probably his quaestor Balbus is meant. (Cf. *ad Fam.* X 32.)

¹⁵ See the letter of D. Brutus to Cicero (*ad Fam.* XI 9, 1).

¹⁶ Vell. II 63, 3. App. III 97.

¹⁷ Vell. II 76, 2.

¹⁸ Cf. App. III 27; 30; 52.

he did succeed in getting it in the negotiations for the triumvirate, we may be sure that he entrusted it to the man of whose integrity and friendship he was surest. It would perhaps be going too far to assert that Antony already at this time suspected that Octavian would attempt to take it away from him, but one can hardly doubt that both Antony and Octavian entered the triumvirate with the conviction that the other would bear watching.

The test of Pollio's mettle came in the following year. After the victory at Philippi, Antony went beyond the Aegean to collect money for the soldiers' pay, while Octavian returned to Italy to superintend the distribution of the lands which had been promised to the veterans. Appian is the sole authority for the statement that before they separated they agreed to divide the provinces as before, but that "it was decided, at the instance of Octavian, to make Cisalpine Gaul independent, as the elder Caesar had intended."¹⁹ That such a claim was made by Octavian on his return to Italy, and that the followers of Antony did not accept it, is evident from the fact that in the disorders of 41 B. C. one of the charges made by Manius against Octavian was that the latter "was defrauding Antony in setting free Cisalpine Gaul, which had previously been given to Antony."²⁰ Pollio evidently refused to relinquish the province without orders from Antony, for we find him still in possession during 41 B. C., and using military force to close the province to troops sent by Octavian to Spain.²¹ The inference would seem to be clear; Octavian had tried to 'free' the province, that is, get Antony's legions out of it, and Antony's legate had stood firm. The relations between Pollio and Octavian could hardly have been very cordial during this period. Indeed it is entirely possible that it was at this time that Octavian wrote against Pollio the Fescennine verses mentioned in the anecdote of Macrobius.²²

From the civil war raised against Octavian by Lucius Anto-

¹⁹ *B. C.* V 3.

²⁰ *App.* V 22.

²¹ *App.* V 20; cf. V 31.

²² *Sat.* II 4, 21. *Temporibus triumviralibus Pollio cum Fescinninos in eum Augustus scripsisset, ait 'at ego taceo. Non est enim facile in eum scribere qui potest proscribere.'*

nius and Fulvia, the wife of Antony, Pollio seems to have wished to remain aloof, not being sure whether the disturbance was really in Antony's interest or had his approval.²³ When he did, at the appeal of Fulvia, move from his province to go to the aid of Lucius, blockaded in Perusia, Octavian advanced against him and forced him to retire to Ravenna.²⁴ It was now the year 40 B. C., and according to the arrangements made at the formation of the triumvirate, the consulship for this year was to be held by Pollio. It is evident, however, that the nominee could not have gone to Rome for inauguration. He was still holding Venetia, levying money and arms,²⁵ when Perusia capitulated about the end of February, 40 B. C.,²⁶ but left the province then, wishing neither to risk a battle with Octavian's forces, nor to expose his troops to the solicitations of Octavian's agents. Proceeding down the Eastern coast, he busied himself in preparing ports and supplies for Antony's expected return.²⁷ Getting into communication with Domitius Ahenobarbus, who was sailing in the Adriatic with a fleet of ships bearing survivors of Philippi, he persuaded him to make common cause with Antony for the impending civil war.²⁸ War, however, did not eventuate. Instead, a reconciliation between Octavian and Antony was arranged at Brundisium, with Pollio acting as the representative of Antony.²⁹ The details of the terms of peace need not concern us here. Our interest is with Pollio, and of his position the evidence leaves no room for doubt. His rôle at Brundisium was the same as he had played ever since the triumvirate had been formed, that of Antony's most trusted associate. In the general rejoicing after Brundisium it is to be presumed that he returned to Rome and entered upon his consulship with the goodwill and acclaim of all parties. His actual administration of that office, however, must have been of rather brief duration, for the peace could not have been con-

²³ App. V 32. Cf. Drumann-Groebe II² p. 7.

²⁴ App. V 33; cf. V 50.

²⁵ Vell. II 76, 2. Macrob. *Sat.* I 11, 22.

²⁶ Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, II p. 97. J. Kromayer, *Hermes*, 1894, 562, 5.

²⁷ App. V 50.

²⁸ App. 1.c. Vell. 1.c.

²⁹ App. V 64.

cluded before the end of September,³⁰ and before the end of the year *consules suffecti* had replaced Pollio and Calvinus.³¹

In the year 39 B. C., Pollio, still in Antony's service, undertook a campaign against the Parthini in Illyria, reduced their stronghold of Salona, and on his return to Rome celebrated a triumph on October 25, 39 B. C.³² So far as we know he never left Italy again. One would expect Antony to have offered him a new command in the East. Probably he did so, and Pollio refused to accept, either because he did not approve of Antony's Eastern program, or more likely because he had had his fill of war. Something of this kind evidently occurred and gave to Antony what he considered the grounds for reproaching Pollio with ingratitude. Pollio defended himself,³³ but seems still to have remained loyal, for although Octavian courted him he remained aloof from politics and devoted himself to literature and law. Velleius Paterculus records that Octavian asked him to join the expedition against Antony and Cleopatra in 31 B. C., but that Pollio refused. "Mea", inquit, "in Antonium maiora merita sunt, illius in me notiora; itaque discrimine vestro me subtraham et ero praeda victoris."³⁴

So much for the historical evidence on Pollio's political career. If I have read the record aright, there is one unifying principle behind all the man's activities throughout this period, and that is his loyalty to his friendship, first for Julius Caesar and after him for Antony. He served them both well, and whatever may be our judgment of the causes into which he followed them, we must surely admire the *fides in amicitia* which he exhibited.³⁵

³⁰ Kromayer, pp. 556-561. Or possibly the first days of October; see Carcopino, *Revue Hist.* 161 (1929) p. 228.

³¹ *CIL* 1² p. 158. Klein, *Fast. Consul.* p. 3.

³² *CIL* 1² p. 50. 77. Horace, *Odes* II 1, 16.

³³ Charisius (*G. L.* I 80, 2) records the title 'Asinius contra male-dicta Antonii.' Knowledge of some charges of ingratitude seems to be implied in the statement of Velleius (II 76, 3) 'quo facto, quisquis aequum se praestiterit, sciat non minus a Polione in Antonium quam ab Antonio in Pollionem esse conlatum.'

³⁴ II 86, 3.

³⁵ I fear, however, that Pollio sometimes sacrificed even 'probitas' to 'fides'. No better evidence of his devotion to Antony's cause can be

But what of Vergil? There is no allusion in the extant historians to the relationship between Pollio and the poet, but certain facts stand out with historical accuracy from the text of the eclogues themselves. By means of these passages we can reconstruct a fairly satisfactory chronology of the association of the two men. Two of the eclogues are addressed to Pollio, the fourth and the eighth. These can be dated with reasonable certainty. The fourth speaks of Pollio as consul, and is therefore of 40 B. C.; the eighth, although it does not mention Pollio's name, was evidently addressed to him as he was returning home to celebrate his triumph over the Parthini, that is, in the autumn of 39 B. C.³⁶ This eclogue contains the following statement:

“A te principium, tibi desinam: accipe iussis
carmina copta tuis.”³⁷

This is the language of poet to patron,³⁸ and clearly means that Vergil had begun on Pollio's instructions a series³⁹ of poems which is now about to be completed. When was it begun? Evidently with the earliest eclogue of our collection, for scholars are unanimous in regarding II and III as the earliest of the pieces, and in III there is mention of Pollio as one who has already approved of Vergil's rustic Muse.⁴⁰ It is, therefore, a reasonable conjecture that the second eclogue was the one with

found than his attempt to convince the Roman public that Cicero had offered to recant the Philippics. The matter is reported by Seneca (*Suas.* VI 15), who comments as follows: *adjeceratque* (Pollio) *his alia sordidiora multo, ut ibi facile liqueret hoc totum adeo falsum esse ut ne ipse quidem Pollio in historiis suis ponere ausus sit.*

³⁶ This view rests upon the combining of the reference to Illyria in line 7 with the reference to laurels (of a triumph) in line 13. For a different view see Frank, *Vergil*, p. 134.

³⁷ VIII 11-12. *desinet* is a variant reading for *desinam*, but does not affect the point under discussion.

³⁸ Cf. *Georgics* III 41: *tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa.*

³⁹ The view of Cartault (*Étude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile*, p. 28) that the *carmina* here referred to consist of the 8th eclogue alone, the ordered verses being a reproduction of Theocritus II, seems to me to be ruled out by the preceding words of the poem. “A te principium, tibi desinam” surely refers to a series. Cf. M. Sonntag, *Vergil als bukolischer Dichter*, 100 f.

⁴⁰ III 84: *Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam.*

which Vergil won Pollio's patronage and received encouragement to continue the writing of pastoral poetry. The second and third eclogues contain no evidence of date, but we shall probably not go far wrong if we assume that it was in the year 42 B. C.,⁴¹ shortly after Pollio took over Cisalpine Gaul, that he invited the young poet of Mantua to his headquarters.⁴² The introduction may have been brought about by Cornelius Gallus, a mutual friend, with whom Pollio had maintained a literary correspondence during his absence in Spain,⁴³ but it is equally possible that Pollio already knew Vergil through his earlier contacts with the *Novi Poetae*.⁴⁴ Probably Pollio himself in his new command hoped to find time to devote himself to letters,⁴⁵ and to build up around him a congenial literary circle. At any rate, the eclogues themselves make it clear that Vergil regarded himself as working under Pollio's orders during a period starting sometime in 42 B. C. and lasting until the summer of 39 B. C. That his literary dependence upon Pollio terminated about this time is evident not only from the fact that never again is Pollio mentioned in his later poetry, but also from the fact that by 38 B. C. he was on such terms of intimacy with his new patron, Maecenas, that he could take it upon himself to sponsor the introduction of another literary aspirant, the poet Horace.⁴⁶ It would seem, then, that when Vergil wrote to Pollio in 39 B. C. "accipe iussis carmina coepta tuis", he intended it as a farewell to pastoral poetry; he had definitely undertaken new work under new patronage. It was not, however, meant as a break with Pollio, for the poet expresses the hope that some day he may be permitted to celebrate Pollio's achievements as tragedian as well as soldier.⁴⁷ Evidently he hoped that the new allegiance would not be incompatible with the old. It proved to be so, but that was due to Pollio's obstinate loyalty to the degenerate Antony.

⁴¹ Cf. Probus, p. 329 Hagen: *Asconius Pedianus dicit (eum) XXVIII annos natum Bucolica edidisse.*

⁴² See DeWitt, *Vergil's Biographia Litteraria*, p. 131.

⁴³ Cic. *ad Fam.* X 31, 6; X 32, 5.

⁴⁴ See page 327 and article there cited.

⁴⁵ *Ecl.* III 86: *Pollio et ipse facit nova carmina.*

⁴⁶ In the spring of 38 B. C. The evidence is collected in Schanz, *Röm. Litt.* II 1^o p. 136. ⁴⁷ *Ecl.* VIII 7-10.

We are now ready to apply the criterion to the first controversial question. Under what circumstances and through whose intervention was Vergil's land exempted from the Mantuan confiscation? The ancient commentators have caused much confusion over the date and other particulars of this event. In regard to time, it is variously placed after Mutina,⁴⁸ or Philippi,⁴⁹ or Actium.⁵⁰ Servius puts it vaguely "cum post occisum . . . Caesarem, Augustus eius filius contra percussores patris et Antonium civilia bella movisset."⁵¹ This looks as if he too were thinking of Mutina; in fact, it almost seems as if he refers to Antony as an ally of Brutus and Cassius.⁵²

The cause alleged for the confiscation is that the Cremonenses "pro Antonio senserant",⁵³ and that the Mantuans became involved either because they too had been partizans of Antony,⁵⁴ or because one of their citizens had given offence to Alfenus Varus,⁵⁵ or merely because they were near Cremona, which was found insufficient.⁵⁶

The distribution of the lands is said to have been in charge of Pollio,⁵⁷ or his successor in Cisalpine Gaul, Alfenus Varus,⁵⁸ or a commission of three.⁵⁹

The protection of Vergil is ascribed to Varus, Pollio and Gallus together,⁶⁰ or to Pollio first and then Varus,⁶¹ or to Augustus through the intervention of Pollio and Maecenas,⁶² or to Augustus through the efforts of Gallus,⁶³ or Gallus and Macer.⁶⁴

⁴⁸ *Vita Probiiana.*

⁴⁹ *Donatus* 19.

⁵⁰ *Probus*, *Ecl. praef.* pp. 327-8 Hagen.

⁵¹ *Ecl. praef.*

⁵² Cf. *Serv. on Ecl.* IX 28: nam Cassii, Bruti et Antonii copias Cremonenses suscepserant.

⁵³ *Vita Serv. Schol. Dan. on Ecl.* IX 28.

⁵⁴ *Vita Bernensis.*

⁵⁵ *Schol. Bern. on Ecl.* VIII 6.

⁵⁶ *Vita Serv. Schol. Dan. on Ecl.* IX 28.

⁵⁷ *Serv. on Ecl.* II 1.

⁵⁸ *Schol. Dan. on Ecl.* VI 6; IX 27.

⁵⁹ *Serv. Ecl. praef.*

⁶⁰ *Donatus* 19. *Vita Probiiana.*

⁶¹ *Schol. Dan. on Ecl.* IX 11; VI 6.

⁶² *Vita Serv.*; cf. *Vita Probiiana.*

⁶³ *Probus*, *Comm.* p. 328 Hagen. ⁶⁴ *Schol. Bern. praef. ad Ecl.* IX.

In view of the obvious impossibility of combining all these statements⁶⁵ into one consistent whole, one is tempted to rely upon the authority of Donatus, whose biography of the poet almost certainly is based upon that of Suetonius,⁶⁶ and to conclude that Vergil's land was involved in the confiscations of 41 B. C., (which are certainly well attested historically), and that "the commissioners Gallus, Varus, and Pollio (then legate of Gallia Transpadana) urged him to appeal to the young Caesar in Rome."⁶⁷ This view, however, when tested by our historical criterion, proves to be wholly untenable. In 41 B. C. Pollio regarded himself as the legate of Antony, the master of Cisalpine Gaul, and resisted even the attempt of Octavian to send troops through the province without his permission. It is inconceivable that he should have consented to share his authority with any appointees of Octavian, or to permit any distribution of the territory which he was holding under mandate of Antony. Even supposing, however, that Octavian had ordered such a distribution, the relations between himself and Pollio in 41 B. C. make it quite impossible to suppose that the latter should have asked any favor from him, either on behalf of Vergil or anybody else. If Pollio served on any commission for the distribution of lands, it must have been after the peace of Brundisium. This, however, is unlikely, as he entered the consulship at that time, and soon afterwards undertook the expedition to Dalmatia. It would seem, therefore, that the grouping of Pollio, Varus, and Gallus must have arisen out of conjectural interpretation of the eclogues. The commentators clearly reveal their belief that the Bucolics were undertaken, on Pollio's

⁶⁵ The passages I have cited are representative, though not complete. The full list is collected in Diehl, *Die Vitae Vergilianae*, 51 ff. An attempt to combine all the statements into a consistent whole was made by Ribbeck in the Prolegomena to his edition, but it has been subjected to successive assaults by Leo (*Hermes* 38), Vollmer (*Rhein. Mus.* 61), Kroll (*Rhein. Mus.* 64), Diehl (*Die Vitae*, Exkurs 1) and others, until practically nothing of the statements of the commentators has been left unchallenged. I believe that this has been carried too far. As Kroll says, "braucht man das Kind nicht mit dem Bade auszuschütten."

⁶⁶ H. Nettleship, *Ancient Lives of Vergil*, 28 ff.

⁶⁷ J. D. Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, p. 436.

suggestion, *after* the lands had been restored.⁶⁸ Starting from this hypothesis it would be a natural deduction that all the men honored in the collection had had some part in promoting the benefaction which inspired the book.

Much more in harmony with the historical record is the statement of the *Scholia Danielis*⁶⁹ to the effect that after Pollio was forced into flight (i. e. early in 40 B. C.), Octavian appointed Alfenus Varus to take charge of the province and to preside over the distribution of lands. This also harmonizes with the internal evidence, for it is evident from the ninth eclogue⁷⁰ that Varus was the sole authority to whom Vergil's pleading for Mantua was addressed. Such an appointment would naturally be made immediately after the fall of Perusia, (probably February, 40 B. C.), and the confiscations around Cremona would have to be placed somewhat later in the same year.

Some scholars who hold to this later date for the Transpadane confiscations wish to show that they were still a part of the widespread program of land distributions begun after Philippi, which, they argue, would naturally take several years to complete.⁷¹ This view fails to give any weight to the statements of Servius and the *Scholia Danielis* to the effect that the Cremonenses lost their land because they had sided with Antonius against Octavian. Now, the fact that Servius was probably thinking of the fighting around Mutina, while it reveals his poor historical judgment, does not discredit his information. Where did he learn that the Cremonenses "pro Antonio senserant"? Some have held that it is another case of conjectural interpretation,⁷² but in this case the explanation is not convincing, since there is nothing in the eclogues which would be likely to suggest it. The probability is that Servius was following an earlier

⁶⁸ Donatus 19: ad Bucolica transit maxime ut Asinium Pollionem, Alfenum Varum, et Cornelium Gallum celebraret, quia in distributione agrorum qui post Philippensem victoriam veteranis dividebantur indemnum se praestitissent. Cf. Vita Serv.

⁶⁹ On *Ecl.* VI 6: fugatoque Asinio Pollione, ab Augusto Alfenum Varum legatum substitutum, qui Transpadanae provinciae et agris dividendis praeesset. Cf. *Schol. Dan.* on IX 27, and *Schol. Bern.* on VIII 6.

⁷⁰ IX 26-29.

⁷¹ Especially Sonntag, pp. 24-36.

⁷² Diehl, p. 55.

writer, for not only do the same words occur in the *Scholia Danielis*,⁷³ but there is a similar statement in the *Vita Probiiana*, of which Nettleship thought so highly that he conjectured it to have been "compiled independently from the same materials as those used by Suetonius."⁷⁴ The most likely solution, it seems to me, is that all these statements derive from the misunderstanding of an historical record, which said that the Cremonenses "pro Antonio senserant", but meant *Lucius Antonius*.⁷⁵ Support of that revolutionary would have been legitimate grounds for the confiscation of the territory of Cremona, though the arbitrary addition of Mantua, attested by Vergil himself,⁷⁶ suggests that it was rather an excuse than a reason, and that once relieved of the opposition of Pollio, Octavian would in any case have lost no time in availing himself of the Transpadane lands to meet the importunities of his veterans. Nor need we think that this order of punitive confiscation would have been countermanded after the peace of Brundisium. Mark Antony probably repudiated entirely the activities of his brother and agreed to the union of the Transpadane province with Italy, thus making its lands available for distribution.⁷⁷ The appointment of Cornelius Gallus, to levy cash contributions on the dis-

⁷³ On *Ecl.* IX 28: *ortis bellis civilibus inter Antonium et Augustum, Augustus victor Cremonensium agros, quia pro Antonio senserant, dedit militibus suis.*

The compiler of these scholia seems to have drawn additional material from a source used by Servius, perhaps the lost commentary of Donatus. See E. K. Rand, *Class. Quart.* X (1916) 158 ff.

⁷⁴ Nettleship, p. 31. The case for the superiority of this biography has been presented more recently by Professor Conway in his *Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age*, 35 ff.

⁷⁵ The *Schol. Bern.* (on VIII 6) use the name Antonius alone and clearly mean *Lucius Antonius*. "huic post victum Antonium apud Perusiam successor datus est Alfenus Varus." It is quite possible, therefore, that the author of the *Schol. Dan.* (Donatus?) also understood the matter rightly and meant *Lucius Antonius* in the note on IX 28.

⁷⁶ *Ecl.* IX 28: *Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae.*

⁷⁷ Seeck (quoted by Kroll, p. 55, note 1) thought that Gallia Cisalpina was made part of Italy after Pollio's retreat from the province. For all practical purposes this would be true, though I should hold that *Octavian's* proclamation was earlier, and the unanimous consent of the triumvirate was later. See DeWitt, p. 146.

tricts whose land was not to be taken,⁷⁸ probably dates from this time, and it is not unlikely that the money was intended for Antony's use, to compensate him for consenting to the confiscations in the interest of Octavian.

It may possibly have been in the fall of 40 B. C., but more likely, I think, in the spring of 39,⁷⁹ that the territory of Cremona was found insufficient to satisfy the demands of the soldiers assigned to it, and the "infelix Mantua" was added because of its propinquity. Vergil appealed to Varus on behalf of the community,⁸⁰ but failed to save it. Gallus, who seems to have held that Varus overstepped his authority in the matter of Mantua,⁸¹ sent or accompanied Vergil to Rome with an introduction to Octavian; and though he could not save Mantua, the poet was assured of the exemption of his own property from the general fate. The first and ninth eclogues tell the story dramatically, though both written after the issue had been settled. In the ninth we learn that by an unexpected blow (quod nunquam veriti sumus), the master⁸² of Moeris has been dispossessed of his farm by a stranger. The master Menalcas had appealed to Varus on behalf of himself and his Mantuan neighbors, and there had been a rumor that by his songs he had saved at least his own land, but in the event his verses have proved of no avail against the weapons of Mars, and he

⁷⁸ *Schol. Dan.* on *Ecl.* VI 64: qui (Gallus) a triumviris praepositus fuit ad exigendas pecunias ab his municipiis, quorum agri in Transpadana regione non dividebantur.

Here again I find no basis in the eclogues for regarding this as conjectural interpretation, so assume that it is derived from an historical source. As for the objection that the 26 year old Gallus was not yet capable of holding so important an office (Diehl, p. 57), I may point out that in the spring of 39 B. C. Gallus was 29 or 30 years of age, whereas Octavian himself was only 23.

⁷⁹ I prefer the later date because the 4th eclogue must have been written after September, 40 B. C., and in it there is certainly no thought of impending trouble.

⁸⁰ *Ecl.* IX 26-29.

⁸¹ *Schol. Dan.* on *Ecl.* IX 10 preserve the precise words "ex oratione Cornelii in Alfenum." See Frank, pp. 124-6.

⁸² Leo (p. 13) would have Moeris a partner of Menalcas; Kroll (p. 51) makes him "ein mit Menalcas befreundeter Nachbar". For the purposes of this paper it makes no difference.

has barely escaped with his life.⁸³ We find, however, at the close of the eclogue that the poet master is away from home, and that on his return his shepherds expect to sing better songs.⁸⁴ As Professor Conway has noted,⁸⁵ the tone of the piece is not one of despair; it describes the catastrophe, but seems to have been written by one who knows that a happy ending is to follow. This happy ending of the poet's own suit, though modified by sadness for the general fate, is seen in the first eclogue, in which Vergil expresses his gratitude to Octavian. To Varus, who now "curavit ne ager, qui Vergilio restitutus fuerat, a veteranis auferretur",⁸⁶ Vergil presently wrote the sixth eclogue. At least it is dedicated to Varus, the soldier,⁸⁷ but its compliments are for Gallus, the poet. This also bears out what I have written, that it was to Gallus, and virtually to Gallus alone, that Vergil owed the introduction to Octavian and the restoration of his lands.⁸⁸ To Gallus also is dedicated the poet's "extremum

⁸³ *Ecl. IX* 3, 7-10, 11-16.

⁸⁴ "carmina tum melius, cum venerit ipse, canemus."

⁸⁵ *The Vergilian Age*, p. 35. Professor Conway very aptly terms the 9th eclogue "a typical case of 'praeteritorum malorum secura recordatio'". I can not agree with him, however, in his interpretation of the 1st eclogue or see in its beautiful closing line any "grave prognostic of increasing gloom".

⁸⁶ *Schol. Dan.* on *Ecl. VI* 6. It is interesting to note that in this matter the statements of the *Scholia Danielis* have been found acceptable everywhere save in the note on IX 11; and even this is not impossible. (See note 88.)

⁸⁷ In the preamble to the poem proper, Vergil seems to apologize to Varus because he can not write a poem to celebrate warlike achievements, apparently implying that Varus has the right to expect such a poem of him, and that only such a theme would be appropriate. This fits Alfenus Varus quite well. It does not seem to me to be at all appropriate to Quintilius Varus, for whom, on other grounds, Professor Frank makes out a strong case. There is no evidence that Quintilius Varus had any military career, but even if he had, there would be no cause for Vergil to apologize for writing him a pastoral rather than an epic. Quintilius Varus, the poet-critic, would probably have preferred the pastoral.

⁸⁸ It is barely possible that Pollio was still in Rome when Vergil made his appeal, and the political situation at that date makes it quite plausible that, if there, he should have interceded with Octavian for the poet. It is tempting to regard this as the explanation of the grouping of Pollio, Varus, and Gallus in the *Vitae* of Probus and

"laborem" in the pastoral field, the tenth eclogue. By 37 B. C. the paths of Pollio and Vergil had definitely divided: Pollio obstinately loyal to a former friendship; Vergil inspiredly faithful to a principle, the good of Italy. It is obvious that Gallus went with Vergil.

Another question upon which our study of the historical Pollio seems to throw some light is the matter of the identity of the child of the fourth eclogue. I need not repeat here the various theories which have been advanced on this perplexing problem. All I wish to say is that in view of the political alignment of Pollio it is of all things most unlikely that Vergil should have written a poem in honor of Pollio's consulship and in it celebrate the birth of an expected heir of Octavian. Granted that a reconciliation had just been effected between the rivals, and that Vergil with all other good Italians hoped that it would bring a lasting peace, would it not have been going utterly beyond the bounds of good taste to prophesy to Pollio that the child of the man with whom he had just made terms was destined presently to redeem and rule the world? It should be remembered that the peace of Brundisium was not an acknowledgment by Antony and Pollio of the supremacy of Octavian; it was a pact between equals. Antony had just as much right as Octavian to hope that his heir would be the one to rule the world, and if Vergil wished to write a poem which would please Pollio, (and that he did so wish must be apparent to every reader of the eclogue), he would have been much more likely to succeed by prophesying future greatness for the offspring of the marriage just arranged between Antony and Octavia. Yet this is impossible as an explanation of what he did write, for, apart from other complications, the peace of Brundisium could not have been concluded before late September,⁸⁹ and Pollio's consulship, in which the child is to be born, must have been nearly over when the marriage was consummated. Nor do I think there is any possibility that the poet

Donatus, and the allusion to Pollio as "intercessorem apud Augustum" in *Schol. Dan. on Ecl. IX* 11. Personally, however, I can not help but feel that all these passages derive from the same error of conjectural interpretation which led Servius to name these three men as a land commission.

⁸⁹ See page 331.

meant a son of Pollio himself, for Asinius *Gallus* must have been already born before Pollio left Cisalpine Gaul, and Asinius *Saloninus* quite obviously commemorates by his cognomen the taking of Salona in the summer of 39 B. C. By sober historical fact, therefore, I am forced to the conclusion that Vergil could not have meant any of these three as the father of the child. My own feeling is that all Vergil wanted to do in the fourth eclogue was to honor Pollio for having given to the world in his consulship a new hope of lasting peace. The child, be it allegorical or real, has nothing to do with politics, and came in only because Vergil had been reading a Sibylline oracle based on Jewish messianic prophecy.⁹⁰

A third and last application of the historical-Pollo criterion may be made to the much debated question of the order of composition of the eclogues. It would be too long a task to review the opinions of all the scholars who have written on this subject,⁹¹ so I shall merely try to indicate into which camps the present tests seem to lead.

Eclogues II and III, as already shown, seem to belong to the early part of Pollio's occupation of Cisalpine Gaul, probably 42 B. C. Next to these I should place Eclogue V. It has been pointed out by Cartault⁹² that vv. 86-87 refer back to Eclogues II and III in such a way as to suggest that these were the only pieces which had then been written. The historical criterion will not help us to solve the difficult question of whether the lament for Daphnis is really a lament for Julius Caesar,⁹³ or for the poet Cornificius,⁹⁴ but it may be pointed out that in either case the subject would have been peculiarly gratifying to Asinius Pollio, the friend of Caesar and the associate of the Novi Poetae.

The seventh can not be dated, but as it is a purely Theocritean study it probably belongs to the early part of the Pollio period, and may reasonably be placed next in order,⁹⁵ probably in 41

⁹⁰ J. B. Mayor, *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue*, pp. 104-5.

⁹¹ See list in Schanz, pp. 50-51.

⁹² *Op. cit.*, p. 56.

⁹³ D. L. Drew, *Class Quart.* 16 (1922), 57 ff. DeWitt, pp. 138-40.

⁹⁴ Frank, pp. 116-7.

⁹⁵ Or possibly before V. See Frank, p. 112.

B. C. The fourth and eighth for historical reasons must belong to 40 and 39 B. C. respectively.

The ninth and first seem to have been planned and written together after the fate of Vergil's land and that of his less fortunate neighbors had been finally settled. The sixth, if it does, as I believe, recognize an obligation incurred to Alfenus Varus in the same connection, probably followed closely. If one places any faith in the ancient notices that the Bucolics were finished within three years,⁹⁶ he will have to assign all three of these pieces (as well as the eighth) to 39 B. C. Since, however, internal evidence almost certainly dates the tenth eclogue at 37 B. C., it seems likely that this 'triennium' is just another mistake of the commentators,⁹⁷ and the nine-one-six group might very well go over into 38 B. C.

HAROLD BENNETT.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

⁹⁶ Donatus 25. Vita Serv. Cf. Probus p. 323 Hagen.

⁹⁷ Nettleship (p. 48) suggested that the 'triennium' error arose because "Suetonius, or the authority whom he followed, probably took the Eclogues as they stood in order of publication, and noticing that the date of the first was about 40 and that of the last about 37 B. C., jumped to the conclusion that the whole work was composed in that period."

PARTICULARISM IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE DURING THE MILITARY ANARCHY.

[The political turmoil in the Roman Empire during the third Century A. D. was largely the result of the survival of large non-Roman and non-Hellenic culture-groups in the Empire, and of the destruction by the Government of the bonds that had previously united them.]

Every student of Roman history is impressed with the great and tragic importance of that period of disorder and calamity which intervened between the murder of Alexander Severus and the accession of Diocletian, which is commonly called "the Military Anarchy." To compress the dismal story within its narrowest possible limits, very few of the fifty years that elapsed between these two events passed without a rebellion, the assassination of an emperor, or a destructive inroad of the barbarians; and whole provinces were reduced to disorder and desolation. When at length the Roman world emerged from these awful experiences, its government and culture had suffered blows from which they never afterward recovered. Efforts to determine the cause of so terrible a catastrophe have not been wanting among modern scholars; and such distinguished students of the period as Seeck, Ferrero, Rostovtzeff, and our own Professor Frank have offered carefully considered hypotheses to account for it. No doubt all of these contain elements of truth; but it seems quite certain that none of them will explain the occurrence of so complex a phenomenon in its entirety. The present writer here presents—with some trepidation, in view of the distinguished champions who have previously entered the field—a factor which, while it cannot be called the sole cause of the calamity, played a very important part in producing that breakdown of political unity that was one of its most striking characteristics. That factor was the emergence within the Empire of several large groups of people, each of which occupied a fairly definite territorial area, and possessed a solidarity based upon cultural peculiarities preserved from pre-Roman times, that engendered a narrow local loyalty in place of the wider imperial patriotism which characterized the ruling classes of the Empire during its best days. To such a phenomenon we may apply the word "particularism."

Third-century particularism was a natural outgrowth of the political, social, and intellectual conditions existing in the Roman world. Prior to the Roman conquest the territory which the Empire came to include had been occupied by a number of groups such as Celts, Thracians, Semites, and Egyptians, each of which had a well-defined culture, based upon identity or close similarity of religion, government, language, arts, social organization, and other equally important matters. In the East Greek, and in the West Latin influences had tended to attack the integrity of these groups and push their institutions into the background; but we must remember that some areas were never either hellenized or romanized, and that in others where the invading cultures appeared to have gained complete control, the masses of the population were but little affected by them. Egypt, Asia Minor, Syria, and the southern part of the Balkan peninsula had adopted Greek as the language of literature and business, and knew Latin only as the tongue of an alien conqueror. There was, it is true, no fundamental hostility between the Greek element in the Near East and the Roman Government; and had the process of hellenization in these lands been complete the cause of imperial unity need not have suffered very much from the fact. But this was not the case. Celtic survived in Galatia until the days of Jerome (Com. on Ep. to Galatians, II, 3); and Phrygian was still spoken in the reign of Diocletian (Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, V, 6). Coptic remained the vulgar tongue in Egypt, and Aramaic in Syria. In all these countries there were some Greeks, and some natives who spoke more or less Greek. But the former were a small minority, usually confined to the cities; and the latter used it as a foreign tongue, and were hardly touched by the spiritual and intellectual aspects of hellenism. An example of this tendency is to be seen in the writers of the New Testament, who used the tongue of Plato and Demosthenes to express purely Semitic religious thought. At Jerusalem in the fourth century A. D. the church services were in Greek; but an interpreter was necessary to translate them into Aramaic for the masses of the worshippers (Pilgrimage of Aetheria, translation of McClure and Feltoe, p. 94).

The religions of this region are too well known to merit a lengthy discussion; and they were not at any time replaced by

the gods of Olympus. For his own convenience the foreign settler or sojourner might identify the oriental gods with his own; but the native continued to call them by the same names and to adore them in the same manner as before. Greek art might modify the appearance of temples and statutes; but not the beliefs of the people. The Near East was merely veneered with Greek culture; and as time went on the veneer tended to disappear. Beneath it were various racial and cultural lines of demarcation, which might, if the imposing structure of Roman unity were shaken, become the boundaries of national states.

What Greek was to the East, Latin was to the West. In Spain, northern Africa, Gaul, the Danubian lands, and Britain it was the language of government, business, and culture; and in these regions it was used by soldiers, officials, merchants, landed aristocrats, and the inhabitants of the larger towns. But the older tongues, and relics of the older cultures, long maintained themselves beside it, especially in the country districts. The sister of Septimius Severus, from Leptis in Africa, could hardly speak Latin at all (*Spartian, Severus, XV, 7*); while Apuleius, another African and a contemporary of the Antonines, had to learn it as a foreign tongue (*Proem. to Metamorphoses*). In the fifth century St. Augustine showed anxiety that the lower clergy should speak Punic, so that the masses might understand them (*Epistles, LXXXIV, 2*). The survival of Welsh and Cornish in Britain proves that Latin never displaced its rival dialects there; and in the fifth century St. Patrick, a Briton of curial rank, laments that he had to learn it, and had not thoroughly mastered it (*Confession, IX; Letter, X*). Gaul was more completely romanized than Britain; but there is evidence that in it also the Celtic language and culture long held their own. Irenaeus complained in the late second century that at Lugdunum, the center of Roman Influence in Gallia Comata, he must speak a barbarous dialect (*Refutation of the Heresies, I, 1, 3*). Fifty years later a Gallic druidess addressed Alexander Severus in the Celtic tongue (*Spartian, Alexander Severus, LX, 6*); while in the late fourth century St. Jerome asserts that it was still spoken near Treves (l. c.). Albanian survived the Roman occupation in Epirus, as did Celtic in Noricum (*Muchar, das röm. Noricum, Vol. I, p. 407*). Vopiscus plainly hints that

the Pannonians of his day spoke little or no Latin (*Aurelianus*, XXIV, 2-6).

Other phases of the pre-Roman cultures were equally stubborn. The Gallic national costume was used for centuries after the Roman conquest (Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule*, Vol. VI, p. 363), while Gallic agricultural and manufacturing methods and Gallic units of measurement continued to predominate for a considerable time. The masses long continued to prefer Gallic art-forms (*ibid.* VI, 45; Rostovtzeff, *History of the Ancient World*, Vol. II, Plate LXXXVIII, Nos. 1-3). Such Celtic and half-Celtic deities as Cernunus (*CIL.* XIII, 3026), Smertrius (*ibid.* XIII, 4119, 11975), Sucellus (Dessau, *Insc. Lat. Sel.* 4614 and 4869), Rosmerta (*CIL.* XIII, 2831 and 5677), Apollo Grannus (*ibid.* XIII, 7975, 8007, 8712, etc.), and a host of others still commanded the homage of Gallic worshippers; in Africa Tanit (*ibid.* VIII, 1360 and 9796), Saturn Balcaranensis (Dessau 4444 a, b, and c), Baliddir (*CIL.* VIII, S 19121), and others were still in vogue; and in the Danubian area temples were erected and sacrifices offered to Bedaius (*ibid.* III, S 11777, 11778, 11779, etc.), Noreia (*ibid.* III, 4806, 5188, 5193, etc.) and Belenus (*ibid.* III, 4774). In Pannonia a distinctive style of dress prevailed. (Lang, *Die Pannonische Frauentracht*, *Jahreshefte*, XIX-XX, *Beiblatt*, pp. 208 ff.). Other evidences to the same effect might be cited; but the foregoing will suffice to show with what persistence the pre-Roman cultures survived in provinces apparently romanized.

There were also political reminders of their earlier independence in the provinces. In Gaul the tribal districts were for the most part preserved, and their names survive in many parts of modern France (Reid, *Municipalities of the Roman Empire*, p. 178). Similar conditions prevailed in some of the Danubian provinces (Patsch, *Die Herzegovina*, pp. 104 ff.).

At the same time we must remember that in such districts as Baetica and Narbonese Gaul heavy colonization by Italians over a long period had brought about a fairly thorough romanization, and that their cultural outlook did not differ in any essential from that of Italy (*Strabo*, III, 2, 14; IV, 1, 12).

To understand why this persistence of cultural diversity proved so disastrous to the Roman Empire at certain times, we must consider two facts; (1) the relatively greater persistence

of pre-Roman and pre-Hellenic cultures among the lower classes, and (2) the tendency of the Roman Government up to the end of the second century A. D. to exalt certain classes, among the provincial populations, and to rely upon them for coöperation in the conduct of local government. Force alone could never have governed so vast a domain: and indeed it played but a small part in the process. Local self-government was almost everywhere the rule: and the medium through which it was carried on was usually the urban community. The Roman and Greek cultures were essentially city products. In the Hellenistic lands there existed at the time of the conquest a highly developed system of municipal government; while in Italy and the older Latin provinces—Cis-Alpine Gaul, Narbonese Gaul, Spain, and Africa—a very similar system had either grown up or been introduced by the conquerors. It was in these urban centers that romanization or hellenization began and reached their fullest development. But in Gallia Comata, Britain, and a few other areas, true cities were very few. Here it was the landed aristocracies that first absorbed the new culture. The Roman Government, correctly measuring conditions, depended upon the urbanized classes in those regions where they were strongest, and upon the tribal aristocracies in the rest. Roman citizenship was fairly common among the citizens of Spanish towns in Augustus's day (Strabo, III, 2, 15); and Vespasian granted Latin rights to all of them who had not already gained this status (Pliny, H. N. III, 30). The nobles of Gallia Comata had become citizens before 48 A. D. (Tacitus, Ann. XI, 23). Upon these classes the Imperial Government counted for loyalty and coöperation; and it rarely counted in vain.

The proportion of Italian blood in many of the provinces was quite small. The expansive force of this once-prolific stock was about spent; and Italy could no longer furnish a sufficient number of either emigrants or soldiers. But the romanization of large numbers of provincials for a long time supplied the deficiency. Each year thousands of Gauls, Africans, Spaniards, Illyrians, etc., were inducted into the auxiliary forces; and after twenty-five years of service the survivors were discharged as Roman citizens, speaking a broken-down Latin and possessed of an imperial patriotism. Commerce spread the use of Latin still further. These romanized provincials, who owed their superior

status to the Imperial Government, and who through various channels imbibed a nearly identical political point of view everywhere, and the hellenized populations of the East, served to cement together the many diverse elements which would otherwise have made government from a common center impossible. The steady growth of this imperial patriotism between the reigns of Vespasian and M. Aurelius will in a large measure account for the freedom from revolt that characterized that period, although other causes must of course be given proper credit for this.

But with the reign of Hadrian certain developments began which greatly weakened these romanized classes, and with them the imperial patriotism which was making provincial government relatively so easy. Hadrian's chief innovation had to do with the army. It had hitherto always been customary to shift legionaries to those places where their services were needed, regardless of their place of enlistment; and after the revolt of Civilis this rule had likewise been followed with the auxiliaries. Hadrian adopted the rule of "regional enlistment." Single provinces or closely related groups of provinces were constituted enlistment districts, each of which was to furnish the troops that served within its bounds (Mommsen, *Die Conscriptionsordnung der röm. Kaiserzeit*, *Hermes* XIX, 1-79; see p. 21). By this plan the senatorial provinces and Italy, where the romanized element was strongest, would henceforth only furnish recruits for the Praetorian Guard; and at the accession of Septimius Severus they lost even this privilege (*Herodian* II, 14; *Dio Cassius*, LXXV, 2). Hadrian's other innovation was the employment of "numeri." These bands were recruited from the more backward frontier provinces or the client states; and they did not use the Latin language or submit to ordinary military discipline while in service (Cagnat, art. "numerus" in Daremberg-Saglio's *Dict. des Antiquités*). With the natives of the more advanced provinces excluded from service, and large bands of semi-barbarous irregulars at many of the greater posts, the non-Roman element in the army was brought sharply to the front, and the power of the military establishment to instill Roman patriotism was greatly weakened. The praetorian prefect of M. Aurelius, a soldier risen from the ranks, did not know the difference between good Latin and Greek (*Dio Cassius*, LXXII,

5). The soldiers of Septimius Severus, drawn from the Illyrian armies, could hardly make themselves understood by citizens of Rome (Dio LXXV, 2). Severus himself legalized soldiers' marriages (Herodian III, 8), thus causing the growth of a military caste, whose family ties would bind them to a particular locality and make it almost impossible to take them away from their homes for any very long time. Alexander Severus completed the process of immobilization by granting the frontier troops lands near their posts (Lampridius, Alex. Sev., LVIII, 3-5). Henceforth each army was only a border militia, drawn from a certain racial group, speaking its language, and forming a perfect mirror of its sentiments. To expect of such men any interest in the welfare of the Empire as a whole was vain. At the siege of Aquileia, in 238, an incident occurred which gave earnest of what might be expected. The Alban Legion had been stationed for years in Italy, and had wives and children there. Fearing that the senatorial forces, against whom their emperor was fighting, might injure their families, they conspired against and slew him, although they had no cause to complain of his treatment of them in any way (Herodian VIII, 5).

Such a situation would have been dangerous under any circumstances; but the military revolution of Septimius Severus, which so greatly increased the importance of the army, rendered the peril still more acute. The soldiers were rendered class-conscious by the emperor's frank dependence upon them; and the lavish favors shown them by Severus and his successors proved to them that they were the masters of the Empire. How arrogantly they used their power may be judged from the indignant complaints of Dio Cassius (LXXX, 4). At the same time Severus wrought fearful havoc among the curials and landed nobility of Gaul and Spain (Spartian, Severus, XII, 1-5), and treated Byzantium, Antioch, and the other eastern cities that had sided with Niger with equal rigor (Ibid. IX, 4-7; Herodian, III, 4). By these measures he weakened the very elements in the provinces that might have served by their superior culture and broader outlook to balance the influence of a partially barbarized and wholly provincialized military caste, and helped to destroy the moral basis of that imperial unity that his victories seemed to have restored.

It is true that the results of this policy did not immediately

show themselves. Severus himself, and after him Caracalla, enjoyed an almost idolatrous homage from the army (Herodian IV, 7; Dio LXXVIII, 17); and after the assassination of Alexander Severus Maximinus seemed to be equally in favor with them (Capitolinus, Maximini, VIII, 2-4). But this military monarchy rested upon a very insecure foundation:—personal loyalty, stimulated by continual donatives and new grants of privileges. To secure the necessary funds Maximinus practiced the most savage oppression of the civilian population; and in 238 the Senate, supported by the victims of this tyranny, overthrew him and restored for a moment the supremacy of the state over the army. The gain was more apparent than real; for within two months after the end of the civil war the praetorians had placed on the throne an emperor (Gordian III.) of their own choosing; but it sufficed to destroy the one bond which had united the various military groups in a single allegiance; and no leader arose thereafter strong enough to restore it.

It was a fateful coincidence that about this time the external enemies of the Roman Empire began a series of dangerous attacks upon its frontiers. The Sassanid monarchy in Persia (Dio LXXX, 3; Herodian VI, 2), the Goths in the region north of the Black Sea, and the various confederacies of German tribes along the Rhine and Danube, began almost simultaneously to hammer at the tottering defenses of the Empire. The result, under such conditions, was inevitable. A series of rebellions broke out, each embracing the armies and provinces dominated by certain definite racial or cultural groups, and drawing little or no support from other parts of the Empire. The demands of the rebels were in each case identical:—protection against the enemy, with relief from the increased taxation made necessary by so many wars. It was not that these peoples aimed at a renaissance of the cultures which they had had before the Roman conquest, or at separation from the Empire. The two centuries of peace and prosperity for which Rome's excellent government had been responsible, and the civilizing work which she had done among her more backward peoples, had given to her government and civilization a moral ascendancy so great that no one could conceive of any peace which was not the “*pax Romana*,” or of a stable government that was not headed by an emperor. The pretenders whom this chaotic period produced

assumed in each case the imperial titulary, and issued coins stamped with Latin or Greek legends—sometimes adding, as did Postumus in Gaul, such devices as “*Roma Aeterna*” (Cohen, *Médailles Impériales*, Postumus Nos. 327-330). Generally they tried to preserve the unity of the Empire by conquering all rivals. But each group saw only its own immediate interests, and either attempted to exploit the resources of the Empire for its own benefit, or demanded from the reigning emperor a degree of attention which conditions made it impossible for him to give.

Every rebellion brought forth its pretender; but in many cases these men were the unwilling puppets of military mobs which they knew were ready to murder them as soon as they failed to do what was expected of them. It required but little prophetic insight in Decius to predict to Philip that the Moesian legions would soon destroy their pretender Marinus, for such was the common lot of those who enjoyed this fatal honor. Decius himself was soon compelled to play the hateful part of a rebel by these same Moesian legions (Zosimus I, 20-21; Zonaras XII, 19). “*Eripe me, Invicte, malis,*” wrote Tetricus to Aurelian from his uneasy throne at Treves (Eutropius IX, 13). Saturninus, another pretender, is credited with the remark: “*Fellow soldiers, you have lost a good general and made a bad prince*” (Pollio, XXX Tyranni, XXIII, 3). Regilian, in 259, was saluted as emperor by the turbulent Moesians because they discovered that his name was derived from “*rex*,” and seems to have had no thought of revolting (XXX Tyranni, X, 3-7). Carus tried to secure his recall from a seditious army when he found that the soldiers wished to proclaim him emperor, and only revolted when compelled to do so (Zonaras XII, 29). Evidence of this kind proves that something more than mere personal ambition was at work; and we may assume that even where men voluntarily headed rebellions against the reigning emperor it was more often because of sympathy with the aims of their supporters than from any desire for personal advancement.

A brief survey of the most important of these outbreaks will go far to bear out this opinion. The three most fertile fields for pretenders were the Rhine, Danubian, and Asiatic frontiers. The elevation of Maximinus in 235 was due to the fear of the soldiers that Alexander Severus was about to buy peace with the

enemy and leave them (Lampridius, *Alexander Severus*, LXIII, 5-6). Decius had to suppress another revolt in the same area, the cause of which is not stated (Eutropius IX, 4). The great inroad of the Franks and Alamanni in 255 was followed by the elevation of Postumus, who gained a victory over the invader (Zosimus I, 37; Zonaras XII, 24). The reconquest of Gaul by Aurelian was followed by the attempted usurpations of Proculus and Bonosus (Vopiscus, *Saturninus*, XII, XIV; Eutropius IX, 17); and a few years later by the outbreak of the Bagaudae (Eutropius IX, 20; Victor, *de Caess.*, XXXIX).

The record of the Danubian provinces was equally stormy. The revolts of Marinus and Decius have been mentioned. Both were caused by Philip's failure to adopt a sufficiently vigorous policy against the barbarians. That Decius knew this is shown by the energy with which he himself attacked the frontier problem. The elevation of Trebonian Gallus while Decius' son was alive and bore the title of Caesar was an act but little less serious than rebellion (Zosimus, I, 24). When Gallus attempted to buy peace from the Goths the indignant Moesians soon elevated their governor, Aemilianus, who had won successes against the enemy (Zosimus I, 26; Zonaras, XII, 21). The same year saw his overthrow by the Rhaetian and Norican armies, and the elevation of Valerian (Eutropius IX, 5). The Sarmatian war of 258-9 saw the elevation of Ingenuus and Regilianus (Pollio, XXX *Tyranni*, IX-X), both of whom had won successes over the invader. Gallienus succeeded in putting down these pretenders; but the danger to him had been very great. His work of repression must have been pretty thoroughly done; for during the next twelve years we hear of no further trouble in that region. Indeed, it is not likely that either the overthrow of Quintillus in 270 (Pollio, *Claudius* XII, 1-6), or that of Probus in 282 (Vopiscus, *Probus*, XX, 1-XXI, 4) can be attributed to particularism on the part of the Illyrian armies. Both men were stern disciplinarians; and stern discipline was resented by all the Roman armies of that period. But this would be mere personal dislike of the emperor, which is a very different matter.

The elevation of Diocletian, however, was pretty surely the result of particularist feeling. The troops which Numerian commanded at the time of his death must have been a contingent of Pannonian and Moesian soldiers who had accompanied

Carus on his Persian campaign, and who were being returned to their regular stations. The death of Numerian did not leave them without an emperor; for his brother and colleague Carinus was still alive, and as the latter had never been in command of this army, we can hardly assume that he was personally unpopular with them. The hasty election of Diocletian, then, must have been the result of a determination among the soldiers to have an emperor of their own choosing (Vopiscus, Carus, XII, 1-XIII, 5; Eutropius, IX, 19).

The Eastern frontier was likewise the scene of many outbreaks of a very similar nature. Philip's peace with the Persians produced in 248 the revolt of Jotapian (Zosimus I, 20) among the Syrian legions. A decade later the capture of Valerian threw the whole border into turmoil, and almost resulted in the formation of an "imperium Orientis" like the state that Postumus was forming in the West. Probably what saved the situation was the attitude of Odenathus, the dynast of Palmyra. He not only helped to check the Persians; but when in 261 Macrian and Ballista, officers of Valerian's, assumed the imperial title (Pollio, Gallieni, III, 1; Zonaras XII, 24) he helped to destroy them. Gallienus was wise enough to grant him sufficient powers and honors to satisfy his ambitions while preserving the externals of subordination and effective coöperation. The Palmyrene Sheik was made "General of the East," with vast powers, and in Palmyra assumed the title of "King of Kings" (Schiller, Geschichte der röm. Kaiserzeit, Vol. I, pp. 837 ff; Zonaras, XII, 23). So long as Odenathus and his suzerain lived the arrangement worked well; and there is no doubt that in the end it saved the East for the Empire. Zenobia, the widow of Odenathus and regent for his son, did not, however, practice the same moderation; and after a series of unprovoked aggressions such as the conquest of Egypt (Zosimus I, 44), she finally threw off all semblance of subordination to the Empire in 271. But the time for such a move had passed. Claudio had crushed the Goths; and Aurelian was a military genius and a man of tremendous energy. Palmyra was taken, and the threatened loss of the East was thus averted. But even the destruction of the city which had sponsored the particularist movement in the Semitic lands did not at once end that movement. Probus was made emperor by the Syrians (Zosimus I, 64); and when he was absent in the

West the revolt of Saturninus broke out in Palestine (*ibid.* I, 66; *Vopiscus, Saturninus*, IX-X). Egypt was the scene of at least one revolt in Probus' reign (*Zosimus I*, 71), and of two during the early part of Diocletian's era (*Zonaras XII*, 31).

Circumstances like these must have made it clear to thinking men that the days when one man could peaceably direct the destinies of the Roman state were past. The imperial office had always been a perilous post, as the untimely ends of so many of the emperors had shown. Mutinies of the legionaries and praetorians, plots of disgruntled officials, and the hazards of battle had all taken their toll of imperial victims; and these hazards had not diminished in the third century. But the development of provincial particularism made this difference:—henceforth every popular governor in a discontented province was a probable competitor for the purple. No mere personal loyalty would prevent his assuming this rôle. Decius, Regilian, Saturninus, Carus, and others had been forced to rebel against lords with whom they had no quarrel. It was not safe to entrust the command of any large force to a subordinate; yet each of three widely-separated frontiers demanded the constant employment of large forces. The only answer to this problem was to forestall attempts at revolution by creating a properly coördinated plural executive, so that each military force capable of supporting a pretender might be under the personal command of an Augustus or a Caesar. In one sense the history of the Military Anarchy is the record of incidents proving the necessity of such a system, and of efforts to create it.

The origin of the coregency in the Roman Empire goes back to Augustus himself; and many of the emperors after him had made use of it. The usual reason for the nomination of a second emperor had at first been to secure the succession for him; and after the reign of Septimius Severus every emperor having a son had taken this step. Vespasian had created, and Hadrian strictly defined, the office of Caesar, which designated its holder as the successor of the reigning emperor. But up to the accession of Valerian no definite steps had been taken to divide the tasks of administration along territorial lines while preserving the legal unity of the Empire and unanimity of administrative policies. The need for continuous military activity on so many widely-separated frontiers forced Valerian to undertake the task of mak-

ing such a division. Before the end of 253 he had caused his son Gallienus to be given the full powers of an Augustus (Zosimus I, 30; Eutropius IX, 8; for a joint titulary see CIL. XI, 826), and during 254 and 255 turned over to him the defense of the Rhenish and Danubian frontiers. When the Persian peril became acute in the East, Valerian took command there, leaving to Gallienus a general oversight of the West; while the latter's son, the younger Valerian, was made Caesar and sent to the Rhine to assume control over Gaul (Zonaras XII, 24; titulary, CIL. VIII, 17680). There were now two Augusti and a Caesar; and we may well examine their mutual relations and respective duties.

The legal unity of the Empire was preserved by the issuance of all state papers in the names of both emperors and the Caesar. The rescripts of the Justinian Code for 255 to 259, and the Egyptian papyri of the same period (P. Oxy. X, 1273; Br. Mus. Greek Papyri, II, 211), are evidence of this. The will of Valerian was the determining factor in all questions of policy. Gallienus himself was inclined to be hostile to the Senate and friendly to the Christians. Valerian, on the other hand, was well-disposed toward the Senate, and a bitter enemy of the Christians. The martyrdom of Cyprian and others in the West as late as 258 proves that Gallienus enforced the laws against the Christians during his father's reign; while as soon as he became sole emperor he stopped the persecution (Eusebius, *H. E.*, VII, 13). On the other hand, the responsibility for the edict forbidding senators to enter military service rests upon Gallienus alone, and dates from the time of his sole reign. (Victor, *de Caess.*, XXXIII, "Quia primus ipse—ne imperium ad optimos nobilium transferretur, senatum militia vetuit," etc.) These two facts prove that, whatever slurs later writers might pass upon his supposed unfilial conduct, Gallienus obeyed his father's wishes as long as the latter was at liberty, even where he had to disregard his own desires in order to do so. Valerian Caesar, while too young to aid in determining policies, was appointed commander-in-chief of the troops on the Rhine, where the dangers of invasion and rebellion made the presence of a person of imperial status necessary.

Under favorable circumstances a scheme so well conceived might have succeeded; but the odds against it were in this case

too heavy. Valerian was too old, and his grandson too young, to play their parts successfully in so terrible a crisis. The invasion of 255 had lashed the Gauls to madness, and they probably felt that Gallienus should have come to their aid in person. In 258 they revolted, chose Postumus emperor, and murdered the younger Valerian. The capture of his grandfather the same year brought the coregency to a tragic end. Gallienus's younger son, Saloninus, was not sent to the frontier at all, and died about 261.

Gallienus in his later years and Claudius throughout his reign ruled but part of the Empire. Even after Aurelian reunited Gaul, Britain, Spain, and the East to the Empire, he did not resort to coregency. He had no sons, and did not reign long enough after the reconquest of the lost provinces to discover the difficulties that the government of regions which had been so long independent of outside control involved. The six-year reign of Probus proved that one man, even though he might be a genius in war and administration, was not equal to the task. Aside from his constant frontier wars he was compelled to crush three pretenders; and there seemed little promise that it would be better in the future. When Carus came to the throne, he promptly recognized the futility of the one-man policy, and returned to that of Valerian.

The coregency set up by Carus was based, as the last preceding one had been, upon the family bond. His sons, Carinus and Numerian, were made Caesars; but as Numerian was still quite young he accompanied his father on the Persian campaign. Carinus had a position which combined the attributes of a Caesar with those of an Augustus. Vopiscus says of him, "Hic, cum Caesar decretis sibi Galliis atque Italia, Illyrico, Hispaniis ac Britanniis et Africa relictus a patre, caesareanum teneret imperium, sed ea lege, ut omnia faceret, quae Augusti faciunt" (Carus, XVI, 2). While denying to the able (but headstrong and self-indulgent) young man the independent station which might make him hard to curb, Carus left him in effective control over all the European and African provinces. Again we find the names of father and sons on public documents (Westerman and Kraemer, Greek Papyri, No. 12; P. Oxy., I, 55; Justinian Code, Rescripts of 282-3). So long as Carus and his sons lived, the arrangement seems to have worked well; and the West was

free from both invasions and rebellions. The deaths of Carus in the East, however, and of Numerian while returning from the Persian campaign, threw all things into confusion once more. But the way had been pointed to a solution of the particularist problem; and it needed only a touch of organizing genius in the next emperor to work out a more lasting and efficient system of coregency. That was what Diocletian attempted to do.

The fear of assassination, by mutinous soldiers or personal enemies, and the necessity of settling succession questions before they arose have long been looked upon as the weightiest causes for the elaboration of the coregency; and they were certainly important. But these perils and problems had existed from the beginning of the Empire; and they had never led to territorial division of imperial administrative functions among coregents. It was only after the recrudescence of cultural particularism in the armies and among the provincials had to a great extent substituted local for imperial loyalty, and had shaken the structure of Roman political unity to its foundation, that such a plan became a necessity. Diocletian, like Valerian and Carus before him, stayed the forces of dissolution for a time by compromising with them; but the history of the fourth century shows only too clearly that the compromise was not a permanent success. The system set up by Diocletian marked but a milestone on the road that was to lead to the partition of the Empire in 395, and ultimately to its disappearance.

C. E. VAN SICKLE.

OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

A NEW METHOD OF INVESTIGATING THE CAESURA IN LATIN HEXAMETER AND PENTAMETER.

[An objective method of studying the caesura in Latin verse by observing the combinations of consonants that occur when a word ending in a consonant is followed by one beginning with a consonant.]

1. The caesura in Latin Hexameter.

There is so much difference of opinion among scholars as to the meaning of the word caesura that it would be impossible to frame a definition of the term that would cover all the senses in which it is used. The simplest and most inclusive definition of the word, as it is generally used by modern students and as it will be used in this paper, is: a word-ending which does not coincide with the end of a foot.

In most of the meters of classical verse, caesuras do not occur at random but are found, for one reason or another, to be more frequent at certain points in the line than at others. In hexameter they occur most frequently in the third foot. In Homer, 98% of the lines, and in Ovid, nearly 100% of the lines contain a word-ending in the third foot. Because of the regularity with which it occurs and because of its central position, this word-ending is frequently designated as *the* caesura. It would be more correct and less confusing if the word-ending in the third foot of the hexameter line were always called the principal caesura. In this paper, it will be so designated.

The term principal caesura has not always been restricted to the word-ending in the third foot, for in the minds of most students, the caesura is more than a mere word-ending. To the definition given above there is usually added the idea that the principal caesura is a pause. When, as frequently happens, there is no break in the sense at the word-ending in the third foot, many would apply the term principal caesura, or even the word caesura alone, to one of the caesuras at which a pause in reading is possible.

The term principal caesura should be applied only to the word-ending in the third foot, regardless of whether or not it coincides with a break in the sense. This involves an assumption which to many is difficult and even repellent, namely, that metrical form

is a thing in itself, independent both of rhetorical form and of the rhythm of oral recitation. This assumption does not mean that the study of metrical form is a mere matter of syllable counting. On the contrary, metrical form groups words and syllables into higher units which can be apprehended by the mind as units, but which do not necessarily coincide with the thought units of the sentence or with the rhythmical phrases into which words group themselves when a passage is read aloud.

Unless one conceive of metrical form as something independent of rhetoric on the one hand and of oral rendering on the other hand, it is impossible to formulate a theory of the caesura in Greek and Latin verse which will accord with the facts. For if the caesura is not purely a matter of metrical form, one is forced to choose between, or in some way find a compromise between, two untenable theories: either the caesura is a rhythmical pause that must be observed in reading even when it does not coincide with a break in the sense, or else it is the most important sense pause or rhetorical division of the line.

Most modern theories of the caesura either adopt outright or lean toward the second of these views. It cannot be denied that for the practical purpose of reading verse with due regard to sense and rhythm, the definition of the principal caesura as the most important sense pause which happens to fall within a foot serves fairly well; but as a description of the metrical form of classical hexameter, it is wide of the mark. When, for instance, Cornu¹ put all lines which contain no sense pause, such as

Est tamen humani generis iactura dolori (Met. I. 246)

under the heading "*Zäsurlose Hexameter*," he ignored one of the most definite and universal rules of Greek and Latin verse composition, a rule to which this line conforms perfectly,—that the third foot shall contain a word-ending. And when, under the same heading, he put the line

Hunc tenuit blandaque manu seduxit et illi (Met. II. 691)

he disregarded, or was ignorant of, the rule,—inviolable for the poet from whom the line is quoted,—that when there is a femi-

¹ Paulus Lieger, *J. Cornus Beiträge zur lateinischen Metrik*, Vienna, 1927, pp. 66-67.

nine caesura in the third foot, there must be masculine caesuras in the second and fourth feet. There are in this line three caesuras which Ovid regarded as essential to the metrical form of the verse. To make all of them audible by a pause in reading is, of course, disastrous to the rhythm and to the sense. But to say, as Cornu did, that the line has no caesura is to use the term in a sense which has no relation to the laws of classical verse composition.

There are however some lines of Latin hexameter which can truly be said to have no caesura in the third foot. Yet these are rare enough to be considered exceptional. In fact, both Horace and Vergil seem to have said, as clearly as any one would want to have it said, that a line which has no word-ending in the third foot is irregular and even awkward. In the following lines, one from Horace and one from Vergil,

Non quiuis uidet immodulata poemata iudex (A. P., 263)

Det motus incompositos et carmina dicat (G., I. 350)

the poets have illustrated in the structure of the verses the effect of badly made poems and clumsy dances.

Whatever the explanation may be, there can be no reason for quarrelling with the traditional rule that in classical hexameter, the normal line contains a word-ending in the third foot. That this caesura has no necessary connection with sense pauses has already been amply demonstrated by Bassett² and Sturtevant.³ If the caesura was a pause at all, the only alternative is that it was a rhythmical pause which did not necessarily coincide with a sense pause. This view appears to have been held by a number of metrists. Lucian Müller, for example, says that the ancients paused longer at the metrical divisions of the line than at the sense pauses. This is however an idea against which common sense and aesthetic feeling alike rebel. Yet common sense and aesthetic feeling are purely subjective. To decide the question on these grounds would therefore be unscientific. Unless positive evidence to the contrary can be found, it will have to be admitted as a possibility that the ancients read their verse in a sort of chant with little or no regard for the rhetorical and grammatical units of the sentence. To say

² *AJP.*, XL (1919), 343-372.

³ *AJP.*, XLII (1921), 289-308, XLV (1924), 329-350.

that this would be in bad taste and therefore impossible would be to apply a criterion which we ourselves could not consistently use, since we habitually sing hymns to the glory of God in which the sense of the words is so completely subordinated to the meter that the result sometimes verges on blasphemy.

The purpose of this paper is to present the outlines of a method for determining by an objective standard whether the Latin poets read their verses with any other pauses than those which the sense demanded. The method which I have followed is to study the combinations of consonants which occur when a word that ends in a consonant is followed by one that begins with a consonant. When two words are closely linked together by the meaning of a phrase, they become practically a compound word. If a word ending in a consonant is followed in the same phrase by one that begins with a consonant, the final and initial sounds thus brought together form a consonant group similar to those which occur within words. Word junctures of this sort will be agreeable if the final and initial consonants run together easily when the phrase is read aloud. In the line

Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexim

the smooth flow of the verse is achieved in part by the avoidance of unpleasant or difficult consonantal word junctures. There are however some combinations of consonants which are difficult to pronounce and which offend the ear when they occur between words that must be closely linked together in reading. If it can be shown that a poet avoids disagreeable combinations of consonants between words that are closely connected in sense and that he permits them to occur frequently when the word that ends in a consonant is separated by a pause from the word that begins with a consonant, then we shall have an objective criterion by which it will be possible to determine whether the caesura,—and incidentally, the end of the line,—was marked by a pause in reading when it does not coincide with a break in the sense.

To test the possibilities of this method of investigation, I began by tabulating all the consonantal word junctures in 2000 lines of the Aeneid. As a result of this study, I became convinced that for Vergil some consonant sequences were disagreeable and were avoided at the principal caesura and at the end of the line when these metrical divisions of the verse did not

correspond with sense pauses. It was therefore clear that Vergil did not read his lines with "metrical pauses," for, had he done so, the disagreeable consonantal word junctures would have been permitted at the metrical divisions of the verse even when they did not happen to coincide with sense pauses.

I then determined to test the results of this preliminary investigation by studying the work of another author. I chose Ovid for several reasons. He is of all the great Latin poets the one who is most interested in the mere sound of words. Harsh combinations of sound displeased him and he avoided them with consummate skill. Since euphony is the thing to be investigated, it seemed best to study the work of an author who is conspicuous for his love of euphony and for his success in attaining it. Furthermore, Ovid is one of the most meticulous of the Latin poets in his observance of the rules of versification and particularly in his adherence to certain very clear and well defined rules for the caesura. There are two rules for the caesura in Ovid which are of particular importance. The first is that the third foot must always contain a word-ending. The second is that when the caesura in the third foot is feminine, there must be masculine caesuras in the second and fourth feet. Both of these rules are so carefully observed by Ovid that the exceptions are negligible. Moreover, Ovid so phrases his lines as to make the principal caesura clearly felt even when it does not coincide with a break in the sense. Besides this he, more frequently than any other classical poet, makes the principal caesura coincide with a sense pause.⁴ As a result, it is necessary in reading Ovid's hexameter to be constantly on the alert lest one fall into the habit of dividing all the lines by a rhythmical pause at the principal caesura. Ovid is therefore the poet who challenges us most defiantly with the question: Was the caesura a pause?

Using more exact methods of tabulating which experience with Vergil had shown to be desirable, I recorded all the combinations of consonants which occur at word junctures in the first 5000 lines of the *Metamorphoses*. I can best explain the methods of the investigation and at the same time present one of its most striking results by describing the behavior of one particular consonant sequence, S N (Table I).

⁴ See the table given by Sturtevant in *AJP*, XLII (1921), p. 304.

The letter S is one of the most frequent final consonants in Latin and the letter N one of the most frequent initial consonants. There are therefore a large number of cases, 291 in the text covered, in which a word ending in S is followed by one beginning with N. In Table I all the occurrences of this consonant sequence in the first 5000 lines of the *Metamorphoses* are classified under three main groups: I. No pause. II. Phrasing Pauses. III. Sense pauses. Each of these main groups is further subdivided according to the metrical nature of the word-endings at which they occur.

In the first of these main groups, that is under the heading **No PAUSE**, are included all the instances in which a word ending in S is so closely linked by the sense and grammatical construction of the passage to the word beginning with N that, if the phrase occurred in prose, no reader would think of pausing between them. At diaereses under this heading, there are only two instances of S N, that is only 0.7% of the total. At minor caesuras, i. e. the caesuras in the first, fifth, and sixth feet, the sequence S N does not occur when there is no sense pause; at the trihemimeral and hepthemimeral caesuras when the penthemimeral is masculine it occurs five times (1.72%), and once (0.34%) when the penthemimeral is feminine. At the penthemimeral caesura when there is no sense pause, the sequence S N does not occur and it is found but once when a line ending in S is followed without any break in the sense by one beginning with N. Altogether, there are only nine occurrences of the sequence S N, or 3.1% of the total, in the first 5000 lines of the *Metamorphoses* when the word ending in S is not separated from the word beginning with N by at least a slight break in the sense.

In the second main group of Table I are included all occurrences of S N where the words are, or might possibly be, separated by a light or phrasing pause. No two readers would agree in every case as to where the sense demands a slight pause nor would the same person, in reading a passage the second time, invariably make the same pauses. Therefore, in order to separate as definitely as possible all cases where there is certainly no break in the sense from those in which there is a well marked sense pause, I have included under phrasing pauses all instances where a slight pause might conceivably be made.

These light or phrasing pauses might of course be indefinitely subdivided. Minute subdivision would however be too much influenced by subjective factors to be of any value. There are however two types of phrasing pauses at the penthemimetal caesura which are clearly differentiated and for which the statistics are given separately. There are, first, lines with normal word order which are divided at the penthemimetal caesura into two distinct word-groups, as in the line

Iamque mare et tellus nullum discrimin habebant
(Met. I. 291)

and, second, lines with interlocking word-order, as in

Nunc latus in fuluis niueum deponit harenis
(Met. II. 865).

The latter is a favorite and clearly defined type of line in Ovid. It has two important characteristics: 1. The interlocking word-order binds the whole line together into a single thought unit. In this respect it is like the verse quoted above from Vergil

Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexim (Ecl. II. 1).

2. The penthemimetal caesura is clearly marked by what one may call disjunctive word-order at this point,—that is, the words *fuluis* and *niueum* have no direct grammatical connection. In this respect the line is radically different from *Formosum pastor*, where the penthemimetal caesura is obscured by the close connection in grammar and thought of the words *pastor Corydon*.

In the third main group of Table I are included all cases where the meaning clearly requires a well defined sense pause. These it did not seem worth while to subdivide so fully as in the first two groups.

The statistics given in Table I show that Ovid was careful to avoid the consonant sequence S N at all places where there was not at least the possibility of a slight pause in reading. Out of 291 occurrences, only nine, or 3.1%, are found at places where the word ending in S is so closely joined in sense to the word beginning with N that no pause could be made. At phrasing pauses the sequence S N is more frequent (35.4%), but by far the greatest number of instances (61.5%) are found at clearly marked sense pauses.

There are in Latin prose many phrases in which the consonant sequence S N occurs, for example *patres nostri, exercitus*

noster, aequalis noster, phrases which one might read a great many times without thinking that there was anything peculiar or objectionable about them. But to Ovid's ear such phrases must have been unpleasant.

One of the few examples in Ovid of the consonant sequence S N not separated by at least a slight pause is in the line

Cui sis nupta, uide, Pandione nata, marito (Met. VI. 634).

In this case the exception proves the rule. The phrase *sis nupta* is difficult to enunciate and is one which can easily be exaggerated into a phonetic monstrosity. The ugly sound of S N seems to have been used here intentionally to heighten the contemptuous tone of the passage. The same effect may have been intended by Cicero in the phrase *compressi conatus tuos nefarios*.

It is interesting to notice that even in our own highly consonantal language, nearly all words beginning with S N have disagreeable meanings or unpleasant and trivial connotations,—for instance, snake, snarl, sneak, sneer, snob, and snore.

The only instance I found in the Metamorphoses of S N occurring at the junctures of run-on lines is (Met. V. 570-571)

Laeta deae frons est ut sol, qui tectus aquosis

Nubibus ante fuit, uictis e nubibus exit.

Here the collocation of the words *aquosis nubibus* appears to have been intended to suggest the unpleasantness of rain-clouds.

The bearing of these facts upon the question of metrical pauses must be evident. If Ovid read his hexameter lines with a metrical pause at the principal caesura and at the end of the verse, we should expect to find this disagreeable consonant sequence at these points even when they did not coincide with sense pauses. But as a matter of fact, I did not find a single case in the first 5000 lines of the Metamorphoses where S N occurs at the penthemimeral caesura except when a light pause is possible. There is only one case, and that apparently onomatopoetic, where S N occurs at the juncture of run-on lines.

The rarity of S N is particularly noteworthy at the principal caesura in lines with interlocking word-order, as in

Nunc latus in fuluis niueum deponit harenis.

The line is so phrased that if a reader is short-winded and needs to pause somewhere for breath, he can do so at the principal caesura. In lines of this type, there is usually no other conve-

nient stopping place. Here, if anywhere, we might expect to find evidence of a metrical pause. But as a matter of fact, only 4.1% of the occurrences of S N are found at the penthemimetal caesura in lines of this type, although they are vastly more frequent in Ovid than lines like

Sors tua mortalis; non est mortale quod optas

(Met. II. 56)

where there is a clearly marked sense pause at the principal caesura and where 19.9% of the occurrences of S N are found. Lines with interlocking word-order are also far more frequent than lines with normal word-order in which there is a phrasing pause at the principal caesura, and yet the latter give us 12% of the occurrences of S N. The conclusion seems to be inevitable that lines like *Nunc latus in fuluis* were read as a single phrase.

Lines with a feminine caesura in the third foot are another special class which calls for particular notice. At the feminine caesura there can, of course, be no consonant sequence, since the syllable before the caesura is short. But since, in lines of this type, Ovid always puts masculine caesuras in the second and fourth feet, we might expect to find evidence of a metrical pause at these two caesuras. But the only case in which I found S N at one of the masculine caesuras where the penthemimetal is feminine is in the passage (Met. III. 193) where Diana addresses the unfortunate Actaeon: *Si poteris narrare, licet.* For anyone who is familiar with the way in which Ovid employs every resource of the Latin language to emphasize the thought and feeling he wishes to express, it will not be difficult to believe that the use of S N is here intended to heighten the effect of contempt and indignation which the words convey.

The facts which have been presented regarding the behavior of S N do not stand alone. There are in the Latin language ten consonants which may stand at the end of a word and fifteen which are found as initial consonants, making a total of 150 possible consonant sequences which may arise through the juxtaposition of words ending and beginning with consonants. In the first 5000 lines of the Metamorphoses as printed in the Teubner text, there are 143 different consonantal word junctures which actually occur. Thirty-four of these are found less than ten

times and are therefore too rare to be of any significance. Of those that remain, 55 must be disregarded: words ending in C, D, and N are nearly all monosyllables and rarely occur before the penthemimeral caesura, at the end of a line, or before a sense pause; words beginning with QV are also irrelevant, since they are, in the majority of cases, relatives and normally stand at the beginning of a clause. There remain 54 consonant sequences which occur more than ten times in the text studied. When these are arranged in the order of frequency with which they occur at sense pauses, it is found that the percentages for all the subdivisions under the first heading (No PAUSE) form descending series, while those under the heading SENSE PAUSES form ascending series. There is no indication that the caesura or the end of the verse has any influence on the frequency of the consonant sequences. While there are undoubtedly other factors besides euphony which influence the behavior of certain consonant sequences, metrical divisions of the verse apparently play no part.

2. The caesura in Latin Pentameter.

The differences between the metrical form of the hexameter and pentameter lines, as well as the uncertainty as to how the latter should be scanned, made it necessary to devise a new scheme for the classification of word junctures in pentameter. The first step was to examine the structure of the pentameter line in order to determine the points at which word-endings and sense pauses are most frequent.

The following table shows the number of word-endings and sense pauses in 100 lines of Ovid's pentameter at the various points where consonantal word junctures are possible, that is, of course, only after long syllables.

	-	-	-	-	-	//	-	~	-	~	-
Word-endings	47	5	62	2	100	18	0		100		
Sense pauses	0	0	5	0	17	0	0		100		

These statistics are based on a count of only 200 lines and are not therefore perfectly accurate. Sense pauses are found now and then at points where I have placed a zero, that is, after the first, second, fourth, sixth and seventh long syllable. But they are rare enough to warrant the statement that Ovid carefully

avoids breaking the line at these points. After the third long, sense pauses are less rare. If one take into consideration the phrasing pauses which are possible at this point, particularly in such lines as

Sed tristis nostros poena secuta iocos (Trist. II. 494).

it is clear that Ovid treated the word-ending after the third long as a minor caesura. In the middle of the line there is always a word-ending and in about 17 lines out of 100 there is a sense pause. At the end of the line there is always a sense pause. In a few cases, the pause at the end of the line is very slight, but I have found in Ovid no clear instances of run-on pentameter lines.

After working out a scheme for the classification of word junc- tures based on these facts, I tabulated the consonant sequences in 5000 lines of pentameter from the *Amores*, *Ars amatoria*, *Fasti*, and *Tristia*. The method of classification adopted and the results of the investigation may here also be illustrated by giving the statistics for the sequence S N (Table II).

At the points where Ovid is careful to avoid breaking the pentameter line by a sense pause, there are only four cases where S N occurs between words which cannot be separated by a pause in reading, that is 1.2% of the total (Table II. 1). One of these is found after the second long syllable in a line which Ovid seems to have made intentionally anserine:

Per quas nos petitis, saepe fugatis opes (A. A. III. 132)

Another instance, this time in an ironical vein, is seen in:

Cuius non animo dulcia lucra forent (Fasti I. 194)

After the sixth long syllable, S N is found once in a line of melancholy tone:

Pallescunt frondes quas noua laesit hiemps (A. A. III. 704)

I have not been able to find a single example of S N after the first long syllable, either in the text studied or elsewhere. That this cannot have been accidental is proved by the fact that mono- syllables ending in S are fairly common at the beginning of the line. I found three (*fas*, *bis*, *tres*) in a single passage of fifty lines (Her. III. 1-50). Several others are common (*res*, *nos*, *quis*). How easy it would have been to have followed any of these words by one beginning with N could be shown by numer- ous examples.

The care with which Ovid avoided the sequences S N at the points where he did not allow the line to be broken by a sense pause shows that he felt this to be a difficult or unpleasant consonantal word juncture which would tend to break the line or at least retard its movement. This conclusion is borne out by the extraordinary frequency with which S N occurs when the word ending in S is separated from the word beginning with N by the full stop which is nearly always found at the end of the pentameter line (Table II. 10).

At the principal caesura of the pentameter line I have classified the consonantal word junctures under four heads. There are, first, the lines in which there is no possibility of a sense pause (Table II. 3), such as

Quoque trahat, quamuis non doceatur, habet (Tr. II. 254)

Aut, si rusticitas non uetat, ipsa rogat (Am. I. viii. 44)

Ille tamen Veneris numine tutus erat (Tr. I. ii. 8)

Cum latet hic pressus nubibus, illa fugit (Tr. I. ix. 12)

Next come lines of normal word order with a phrasing pause at the caesura (Table II. 5), as in

Quam procul a nobis Naso sodalis abest (Tr. I. vii. 10)

In the third group are the lines with interlocking word order in which the words immediately before and after the caesura are not directly connected in sense (Table II. 7), as in

Defensast armis nostra puella suis (Am. II. v. 48)

In the last group fall the lines with a heavy pause at the caesura (Table II. 8), as in

Inscribant spoliis: Naso magister erat (A. A. III. 812)

The percentages of S N under each of these headings are, respectively: 2.5, 5.2, 18.4, 4.6. The significance of these percentages depends in part upon the relative frequency of the types of line represented. The first, second, and fourth of these types of line are of nearly the same frequency, although the first type, that is lines without a pause at the caesura, are found somewhat oftener than the other two. The third type, that is lines of interlocking word-order, comprises about half of the total number of lines. From this it appears that, in proportion to the chances of its occurrence, S N is relatively infrequent at the caesura when no pause can be made in reading. It is apparent

therefore that S N was avoided at the caesura of these lines, though not with the same care as in hexameter. It should be noticed that the percentages for the second and third items under the heading *No PAUSE* in Table II are practically the same. There is therefore no more evidence for a metrical pause at the principal caesura of the pentameter line than there is for a metrical pause after the third long syllable.

The most striking difference between the statistics for hexameter and those for pentameter is in the frequency of S N at the principal caesura in lines with interlocking word-order. In pentameter 18.4% of the occurrences of S N come under this heading. It would seem to be impossible to account for this fact except by assuming that lines like *Defensast armis nostra puella suis* were read with a slight pause at the principal caesura.

The results just summarized are confirmed by a study of all the consonant sequences which occur in the text covered by the investigation. A much larger body of text will however have to be studied before accurate statistics can be given for a majority of the consonant sequences.

While the results arrived at in the study of the pentameter line are not so clear and convincing as those which were obtained for the hexameter line, they appear to me to support the belief that there was no metrical pause in pentameter verse. The facts which I have discovered seem to me to outweigh the arguments in favor of the modern way of scanning pentameter verse and to furnish objective evidence that one ought to read without any pause at the caesura such lines as

Hoc legat et lecto carmine doctus amet.

TABLE I.

Statistics of S N in Hexameter

NO PAUSE	Occurrences	Percentages
Diaereses	2	0.7
Minor caesuras	0	0
Trihem. & hept. caesuras		
when penthemimeral is masculine	5	1.72
when penthemimeral is feminine.....	1	0.34
Penthemimeral caesura	0	0
End of verse.....	1	0.34
Total	9	3.1

PHRASING PAUSES

Diaereses	6	2.1
Minor caesuras	2	0.7
Trihem. & hept. caesuras		
when penthemimeral is masculine.....	20	6.9
when penthemimeral is feminine.....	3	1
Penthemimeral caesura		
normal word-order.....	35	12
interlocking word-order.....	12	4.1
End of verse.....	<u>25</u>	<u>8.6</u>
	Total	103
		<u>35.4</u>
SENSE PAUSES		
Diaereses	2	0.7
Penthemimeral caesura	58	19.9
All other caesuras	16	5.5
End of verse	<u>103</u>	<u>35.4</u>
	Total	179
		<u>61.5</u>
	Grand total	291
		<u>100.0</u>

TABLE II.

Statistics of S N in Pentameter

NO PAUSE	Occurrences	Percentages
1. After 1st, 2nd, 4th, 6th and 7th long.....	4	1.2
2. After third long.....	9	2.8
3. At the caesura.....	8	2.5
	Total	21
		<u>6.5</u>
PHRASING PAUSES		
Normal word-order		
4. At all points except the caesura.....	5	1.5
5. At the caesura.....	17	5.2
Interlocking word-order		
6. After the third long.....	18	5.5
7. At the caesura.....	60	18.4
	Total	100
		<u>30.6</u>
SENSE PAUSES		
8. At the caesura.....	15	4.6
9. At all other points in the line.....	4	1.2
10. At the end of the verse.....	186	57.1
	Total	205
		<u>62.9</u>
	Grand total	326
		<u>100.0</u>

MEDEA'S WAXING WRATH (Eur. *Med.* 106-108)

[Read δῆλον δ' ἀρχῆς ἐξαιρόμενον | νέφος οἰμωγῆς ὡς τάχ' ἀν αἴξοι (for τάχ' ἀνάξει [L]) | μείζονι θυμῷ.]

Commentators explain ἄλλοι ἄλλων ἄλλως. Yet the poet expressed a definite thought, which allows no ἄλλως—οὐδέποτε οὐδαμῆ οὐδαμῶς ἄλλοιώσιν οὐδεμίαν ἔνδεχεται.

Many editors underwrite ἀνάξει (L) with Elmsley's iota subscript, thinking they solve the problem by that simple stroke, while others, many others, burn with enthusiasm for ἀνάψει, the reading of BAVP. But Medea is not *setting* her cloud *afire*; nor does it *dart up*; and certainly ἀνάψει is not equivalent to ἀστράψει. Cf. 378 ἴφαψω δῶμα νυμφικὸν πυρί.

One who honestly thinks that we should accept the readings of our manuscripts as the actual words which the poets penned has not gotten very far in the matter of textual criticism. Such a person is wont loosely to fling the charge that one who endeavors to go behind the manuscripts and find the original is trying to *re-write* the Greek tragedies, whereas he is only attempting to correct passages which have suffered mutilation in centuries of transcription. On the other hand, an emender that departs far from the reading of the manuscripts and seeks to substitute for the text something which he thinks the poet might have said, something which the "corrector" has evolved out of his own inner consciousness, without due regard to the letters which the manuscripts furnish, may be said indeed to be *re-writing* the masterpieces of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides: he is merely adding to the burden already too great by cluttering the pages of critical editions with a mass of useless conjectures only to muddle the brains of scholars and waste their precious time. Scribes copied mechanically; they did not make violent alterations in the text; but sometimes they were careless, through haste or drowsiness, and then an error would creep in inadvertently and be transmitted to the next copyist, who transcribed either what he actually saw or what he heard his *voix intérieure* dictate. I have collected a multitude of well-attested examples of mistakes due to the dropping out of a letter; and it is to this kind of error in copying, I think, that we owe the meaningless ἀνάξει of L in the passage I am about

to discuss. Even as I write this, I observe *λύσιν* for *γῆλυσιν* in *H. F.* 1041. Cf. *Med.* 1077, where B has *προσμᾶς* for *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, *Heracl.* 108, *πρὸς τὸ πᾶν* for *προστροπάν*, *Hel.* 462 *μεπτόν* for *μεμπτόν* (L), 633 *δάρν* for *δάκρυ* (P). The transposition of letters is also a common source of corruption, several examples of which I have given in emendations I have published in previous numbers of this journal. Cf. *Eur. Phoen.* 332, where P reads *φάσγαν* for *σφαγάν*.

What does a small cloud do *ἔξ ἀρχῆς*? It waxes, grows larger, increases in size. In fact, Euripides tells us this himself in another play: *στυγνὸν δ' ὄφρύων νέφος αὐξάνεται* (*Hipp.* 172). In the *Medea*, too, the *νέφος* is not a real cloud: it is a *νέφος οἰμωγῆς*, a *Wehklagenebel*. And in the next verse *μείζονι θυμῷ* does not refer to a visible cloud but to *κραδίαν* and to *χόλον*; the language is simply figurative and picturesque: *ἔχόσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον* (*ε* 284).

The thirty attempts to emend the passage have resulted in failure, I think, primarily because scholars have not considered carefully enough the two ends of the sentence. Every part has been scrutinized with scrupulous care except *δῆλον* and *ἀνάξει*.

To begin at the beginning, Earle changes *δ' ἀρχῆς* to *γὰρ γῆς*. But the nurse has not in mind a topographically localized *νέφος*; it is not a cloud rising above the Attic horizon; it is not starting *ἐκ γῆς*, but from a mere *οἰμωγῆς*, and is now in process of formation. This, says the nurse, is evident, and ominous. What does it portend? Will it wax? If so, it is fraught with danger to the children, will not pass over: *κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν ὥσπερ νέφος* (*Dem. De Corona* 188). At all events, the children had better be removed from their mother's sight, for she has already been setting her heart in ferment (99). The nurse is not saying that the cloud will leap up with a bound, like Orestes (*ἀνάξας, I. T.* 315). What is clear (*δῆλον*) is that a cloud is rising, that is all. The *ώς* clause is a mere appendage. The nurse is not prophesying: she is simply describing what is going on. But the present ending *-ξοι* seemed to the scribe to be a future, and so he wrote a future, inadvertently missing a letter (as he changed the tense) and thereby introducing into the text a different verb. Earle declares that *ἀνάψει* is used "instead of *ἀνάψον* after *δῆλον*, because a participle has been used already, though not in immediate construction with *δῆλον*." But *ώς* is not to be construed with *δῆλον* at all, whereas the participle *must* be (first come, first

served)—and the auditor would not change his mind after hearing the rest of the sentence. Moreover, *ώς* is seldom used after *δῆλον*, the norm being *ὅτι*. In fact, so regularly was the latter employed that *δῆλον* *ὅτι* was welded into a compound adverb (*δηλονότι* = *δηλαδή*), whereas *δηλονώς* would have been a monstrosity. In the whole corpus of Plato I have found but two examples of *δῆλον* *ώς*, and one of these does not count. The first is *Phaedrus* 270 E, and the second, *Republic* 550 D, where *ώς* in another construction is merely repeated: *οὐκοῦν* *ώς* μεταβαίνει . . . *ρητέον*; *καὶ μήν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, καὶ τυφλῷ γε δῆλον* *ώς* μεταβαίνει. In all Euripides there is but one example (*Hipp.* 627), and here *τούτῳ* precedes. Certain things the Greek did not say. So regularly *λέγει* *ὅτι*, but *λέγεται* with the infinitive. This conjunction *ώς* and the participle *ἔξαιρόμενον* have given the commentators no end of trouble, which one surmounts in one way, another in another; and some avoid the difficulty altogether by observing a discreet silence. Wecklein changes *ἀρχῆς* to *ἀχῆς*, inserting *θ* after *οἰμωγῆς*, and once upon a time he considered *μείζονι θυμῷ* intruders. Prinz (after Witschel) reads *όργης* and *οἰμωγαῖς*, as does Earle. This was proposed by Plüss (Bonn, 1865). Mekler reads *ἰαχῆς*. Headlam places a period after *οἰμωγῆς*. Porson and Blomfield explain *ἀρχῆς* *ἔξαιρόμενον* by *ἐξ ἀρχῆς αἰρόμενον*. Both construes *ἀρχῆς* with *μείζονι* and explains “majore quam initio.” Musgrave alters *δῆλον* to *δῆλοι*. Verrall remarks: “the grammatical construction is *δῆλον δ' ώς* (*Μήδεια*) *τάχ' ἀνάψει μείζονι θυμῷ νέφος* *ἔξαιρόμενον* *ἀρχῆς* (*τῆς*) *οἰμωγῆς*,” and he translates, ‘*Tis plain that her cry is the beginning of a cloud which soon she will fire with increase of wrath.* Some scholars even change *τ' ἀρχῆς* to *τάρχης* (= *ταραχῆς*). Klotz renders: “a primo extorientem quasi nubem lamentationis ilico majore animi commotione excitaturam esse.” Méradier reads *ἀνάξει* and translates: “Il est clair que cette nuée montante de sanglots bientôt se déployera avec plus de fureur.” But how does M. Méradier get “se déployera” out of *ἀνάξει*? In a footnote he remarks: “les mots *ἀρχῆς* *ἔξαιρόμενον* sont suspects.”

The reading *ἀνάψει* is probably due to some scribe who saw that *ἀνάξει* did not harmonize with *νέφος*. One does not kindle a cloud. Cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 242 f. *μέγαν φάκελον* *ξύλων* | *ἐπιθεὶς* *ἀνάψεις*; There is no allusion directly to lightning anywhere in the whole

sentence. Euripides is thinking neither of the red levin nor of the thunder's roar. Elmsley's ἀνάξει is just as inept as ἀνάψει. A cloud does not ἀναίσσει—except perhaps over the sidewalks of New York, where one's vision is obstructed by skyscrapers—it gathers in the distance and mounts slowly toward the zenith as it increases in volume. The bursting of the storm may be swift and sudden but not the ascension—ἐξ ἀρχῆς—of a νέφος, which is mayhap no larger than a man's hand, for it goes: νέφος ἔρχεται οὐρανὸν εἴσω (Π 364). We have not here to do with Tennyson's flying cloud and frosty light. Euripides is thinking rather of the gradual accumulation and augmentation of the pristine cloudlet:

δῆλον δ' ἀρχῆς ἔξαιρόμενον
νέφος οἰμωγῆς ὡς τάχ' ἀν αἴξοι
μείζονι θυμῷ.

The phrase *μείζονι θυμῷ* has no point if we read either ἀνάξει or ἀνάψει. As Socrates says, ὅταν μείζον τι γίγνηται, ἀνάγκη που ἐξ ἐλάττονος ὄντος πρότερον ἐπειτα μείζον γίγνεσθαι (*Phaedo* 70 E). The miniature cloud could not leap up, or lighten, with greater fury if it had not been performing in the same manner with lesser fury. But not a single dart or leap or bound or flash has been indicated. Not ἀξεῖ but αἴξοι harmonizes with *μείζονι*, as well as with the general thought. Cf. *Plato, Leg.* 681 Α τούτων μείζονων αὐξανομένων ἐκ τῶν ἐλαττόνων, *Hdt.* 6.132 μᾶλλον αἴξετο, *Eur. I. A.* 572 μείζω πόλιν αἴξει, *Fr.* 330.4 χαιμῶνα αἴξει συντιθεὶς πυκνὸν νέφος, *Fr.* 1029.5 μᾶλλον αἴξεται, *Arist. A. Po.* 78b6. Herodotus used the verb of a rising wind: αὐξόμενον ἔμαθον τὸν ἄνεμον (γ. 188). Cf. the Platonic αὐξάνειν >< ισχναίνειν.

But what is the meaning of ἀρχῆς? Pflugk thinks it is to be taken with ἔξαιρόμενον simply as an equivalent of ἀρχόμενον. But ἀρχῆς refers to the beginning of the formation of the cloud, ἔξαιρόμενον to the process, to the gradual growth (>< *μείζονι θυμῷ*), τὸν ὀλίγον ὅγκον ὄντα ὑστερὸν πολὺν γεγονέναι, and αἴξοι to the later stages of development: ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ἀνάγκη πᾶν τὸ γυγνόμενον γίγνεσθαι (*Plato, Phaedr.* 245 D). The cloud is, so to speak, being *inflated*, ἔξαιρόμενον (*Dem. Eloc.* 234). Cf. *Plato, Leg.* 716 Α ἔξαρθεὶς ὑπὸ μεγαλανχίας (*puffed up*), *Soph. A. 1066*, *Eur. I. A.* 919, *Ar. Vesp.* 427, I 646. At first there is not a cloud in the sky: οὐδέ ποθι νέφος ἔστι (ν 114). Then there

is heard an *οἰμωγή*, which is the *ἀρχή* (*ἀειρομένη ὡς τε νέφος*, Ψ 366). But it has not as yet reached the bursting point: *ἐν ἀρχῇ πῆμα κοῦδέπω μεσοῖ* (60). The storm comes later. Cf. Soph. *Ai.* 1148 *σμικροῦ νέφους τάχ' ἀν τις ἐκπνέυσας μέγας | χειμῶν κατασβέσει τὴν πολλὴν βόνην*. After the *μέσον* the *φθίσις* > *αὔξησις*. So *μὴν φθίνων* in Homer, so *νῦξ, ἡμέρα, σελήνη, νέφος* all wax and wane. Cf. Plato, *Parmen.* 157 B, *Symp.* 211 A, Eur. *Heracl.* 779, κ 93 *ἀέξετο κῦμα, Σ 110 χόλος . . . ἀνδρῶν ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀέξεται ἡύτε καπνός, Ι 646 οἰδάνεται κραδίη χόλῳ*.

The cause of the corruption of the passage is, I think, not far to seek: *ν* dropped out and *ἀν* attached itself to *ἄξοι* to form *ἀνάξοι*. Cf. 966, where A reads *ἄξει*, the other MSS *αὔξει* and *ἄλλᾳ* for *ἄλλαχᾶ* in Soph. *Phil.* 701. This would be easy, if *ν* was mistaken for *ι*, which would then be written as iota subscript. In Soph. *O. C.* 628 it is impossible to tell whether L reads *μον* or *μοι*, and in *Trach.* 40 Brunck would read *ὅποι* instead of the MS *ὅπου*. I am inclined to think that *ν* was misread *ν*. Then *τάχαναν* *ξοι* naturally became *τάχ' ἀνάξει* and was passed on to modern editors instead of the original *τάχ' ἀν αὔξοι*. In Eur. *Suppl.* 854 we find an identical error (*ἀν* for *αν*). Palaeographically, *αὔξει* and *ανάξει* are equivalent. It is just these expressions of the sermo familiaris that we should expect to find in Euripides: *τάχ' ἀν, τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ζηλῶ σε, ἔχ' ἡσυχος*. I should even accept Hermann's conjecture *τάχ' ἀν* in Soph. *Phil.* 305, where the MSS read *τάχ' οὖν τις ἄκων ἔσχε*. So Dissen *οὖν* for *ἀν* in verse 572. Cf. Plato, *Phaedr.* 256 C *τάχ' ἀν . . . εἰλέσθην*. The phrase does not mean 'very soon,' but *ἰσως, forsitan*. Cf. *Alc.* 1101. In Soph. *O. C.* 965 we find it with the present participle and in *O. R.* 523 with the aorist. Even without *ἀν* the adverb *τάχα* does not always imply an immediate future: it is not a *subito, sogleich, tout de suite*, but a deferred *εὐθύς*, e. g. Plato, *Gorg.* 466 A *ἄλλ' οὐ μημονεύεις τηλικοῦτος ὄν, ὃ Πῶλε; τί τάχα δράσεις; Que feras-tu plus tard?* This fact may have something to do with the corruption in the passage I am discussing: *τάχα* was interpreted as equivalent to *ταχέως* and *ἀν*, being detached, was attracted to the adjoining verb to form a compound, the succession of alphas (and *ἀν*'s) contributing to the generation of *τάχ' ἀνάξει*. Parmentier's correction of the MS *ἥξετ'* to *αὔξετ'*

in *Her. Fur.* 792 is, I think, a palmary emendation. See *Rev. de Phil.*, 1920, p. 154.

One cannot be cocksure, it is true, in such matters. As Socrates says (Plato, *Charmides* 172C) when he is searching for a definition of *σωφροσύνη*: *τάχα δ' ἄν, ἔφη, οὐτως ἔχοι. Ἰσως, ἢν δ' ἔγω· ίσως δέ γε ἡμεῖς οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἐξηγήσαμεν.* At all events, Medea's cloud is a swelling cloud of wrath; it is growing larger from the small wail of woe; and she is packing it with *μείζον* *θυμῷ· αὐξάνεται, ἀεὶ τέθηλε κάπι μείζον ἔρχεται* (*Soph. Phil.* 259). Neither *ἀνάξει* nor *ἀνάψει* will do; and M. Méradier's laudable attempt to defend the manuscript reading *ἀνάξει* is foredoomed to failure: *ἀνάξει*, in any sense, cannot be said of a cloud. One can 'soulever la tête,' but not a cloud. Cf. *Soph. Phil.* 866 *ἀνάγει* (= *αἴρει*) *κάρα.* Medea will soon raise the devil (as the nurse divines), but she will not undertake to lift a cloud, which, indeed, does *rise* (of itself), when the storm is coming on; but it is not *raised* by a person in a passion, actually or metaphorically. Clouds also *lift*, but when they do, the storm is over. And, speaking of thunder-storms, I wonder what the stout defenders of manuscript readings would say about *βροντᾶς* *αὐγᾶς* in *Soph. Phil.* 1199, if we had no scholiast to inform us that the correct reading is *βροντᾶς αὐγᾶς?* Or of Eur. *Suppl.* 874-80, where in six lines Stobaeus gives us a different text from our manuscripts in a dozen words. If a copyist had inadvertently written *αὐξαμένων* in Plato's Laws, as I did in the first draft of this article, some would be so superstitious, I suppose, as to maintain that we should respect the manuscript "authority," and that one who dared to change to *αὐξανομένων* would be guilty of treason, of attempting to *re-write* Plato.

J. E. HARRY.

ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

THE TEXT OF TWO SOURCES FOR CAMPANIAN TOPOGRAPHY.

I. STATIUS, SILVAE III. 5, 104.

The present suggestion to emend the text of Statius forms the sequel to my note which appeared on pages 372 and 373 of *A.J.P.*, L, 1929. A proposal was there made for dealing with a difficulty inherent in the manuscript tradition of the poet's account of Neapolitan amenities; and it now is practicable to extend this proceeding to the lines which immediately follow, in which are enumerated certain places in the region of the gulf at which other delights were to be found:

95 nec desunt variae circa oblectamina vitae:
sive vaporiferas, blandissima litora, Baias,
enthea fatidicae seu visere tecta Sibyllae
dulce sit Iliacoque iugum memorabile remo,
seu tibi Bacchei vineta madentia Gauri
100 Telebouumque domos, trepidis ubi dulcia nautis
lumina noctivagae tollit Pharus aemula lunae,
caraque non soli iuga Surrentina Lyaeo,
(quae meus ante alios habitator Pollius auget),
† denarumque lacus medicos Stabiasque renatas.
105 mille tibi nostrae referam telluris amores?

The monstrosity *†denarumque* of the manuscripts had received drastic treatment at the hands of earlier editors: *Aenariaeque*, *Inarimesque*, *Nitrodumque*, *Dimidiaequa*. Vollmer's *Aenarumque* is palaeographically unobjectionable, and was accepted by Diehl in *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, s. v., though the word does not actually appear elsewhere. Klotz however rightly rejected all these proposals: *Dimidiaequa* involves too arbitrary a change, and all the others, introducing a reference to the modern Ischia, do violence to the topographical order; for after the series of localities in the region to the northwest of the gulf Baiae, Cumae, Misenum, Mons Gaurus—, there follows another group, consisting of places at the southeast limit of Campania—Capreae, Surrentum, Stabiae,—in which there cannot suitably be introduced an island belonging with the first-named region.

The solution lies in reading *venarumque*; a proper name is not required. With its first word thus restored, the opening

part of line 104 refers to the remarkable group of mineral springs which are still today a feature of that portion of the Stabian plain which lies along the edge of the gulf at the foot of the great limestone mass of the Sorrentine promontory. Columella, X. 133, has *fontibus et Stabiae celebres*; the elder Pliny, *N. H.* XXXI. 9, mentions one of the medicinal springs by name: *item in Stabiano quae Dimidia vocatur*; and the references in Cicero, *ad Fam.* VII. i. 1 and 5, to the *dolor aliqui corporis, infirmitas valetudinis* and *imbecillitas valetudinis* which the orator fears may have detained his friend in the region suggest balneotherapy as having influenced his choice of sojourn. [It is precarious to follow G. Cosenza, *Stabia* (Trani 1907), p. 157, in assigning to Stabian territory the healing spring described in the sixteen verses that are quoted from a certain Heliodorus by Stobaeus, *Flor.* IV. xxxvi. 8 W.-H.: the well-known Mons Gaurus appears to be mentioned; the snowy whiteness of the place (not the mountain) might be due to sulphurous fumes.]

The word *vena* may denote not only a vein but an artery; and the phrase *venarum lacus medicos*, though perhaps not rigorously scientific, is intelligible to the layman as representing a poet's effort to indicate the benefit that was observed to be derived by the patient's circulatory system through the use of these waters, which are now recognised as possessing marked radioactive qualities. If scholars see fit to accept the emendation here put forward, they will have recovered a text of Statius free from topographical waywardness and at the same time another ancient reference to the therapeutic springs of Stabiae.

Before we leave this line, attention must be called to the inadequacy of Vollmer's interpretation of its last two words, *Stabiasque renatas*. The city had come to new life after the disaster of 79 A. D. because the changes in the coast-line and in the course of the river Sarnus had rendered the site of its old rival Pompeii no longer suitable for overseas commerce; the life thus resumed was not merely that of the period immediately preceding the outbreak of Vesuvius, when there appears to have been no real town in this region nearer than Pompeii, but that of Stabiae's prime before Sulla demolished the city and re-assigned its territory. But the few inscriptions from Stabiae in

C. I. L. do not suggest that this new prosperity was a thing of great consequence or long duration.

II. FLORUS, II. viii. 4.

Prima sedes velut rabidis beluis mons Vesuvius placuit. ibi cum obssiderentur a Clodio Glabro per fauces cavi montis vitineis delapsi vinculis ad imas eius descendere radices et exitu inviso nihil tale opinantis ducis subito impetu castra rapuerunt.

This passage in the narrative of the war with Spartacus is here printed without commas, since the faulty punctuation of modern editions has obscured its meaning. When I prepared *A Companion to Pompeian Studies* (Rome 1927), I misguidedly retained the traditional comma after *Glabro*; Forster in the Loeb edition does the same and translates:

The first position which attracted them (a suitable one for such ravening monsters) was Mt. Vesuvius. Being besieged here by Clodius Glabrus (*sic*), they slid by means of ropes made of vine-twigs through a passage in the hollow of the mountain down into its very depths, and issuing forth by a hidden exit, seized the camp of the general by a sudden attack which he never expected.

The difficulties which beset the passage in this form do not require emphasis. Fortunately the brilliant manoeuvre in question has been described for us by two other authors:

Plutarch, *Crassus*, IX. 1 and 2: ἔπειτα Κλαδίου στρατηγοῦ . . . πολιορκοῦντος αὐτούς ἐν δρει μίαν ἔχοντι καὶ χαλεπήν καὶ στενήν ἀνοδον, ἦν δὲ Κλαδίος ἐφρούρει, τὰ δὲ ἀλλα κρημνούς ἀποτόμους καὶ λισσάδας, ἀμπελον δὲ πολλὴν ἀγραν ἐπιπολῆς πεφυκάν, ἔτεινον τῶν κλημάτων τὰ χρήσιμα, καὶ συμπλέκοντες ἐξ αὐτῶν κλιμακίδας εύτερους καὶ βαθειάς, ὥστε ἀνωθεν ἀνηργημένας παρὰ τὸ κρημνώδες ἀπτεσθαι τῶν ἐπιπέδων, κατέβαινον ἀσφαλῶς δι' αὐτῶν πλὴν ἐνός. οὗτος δὲ τῶν δπλων ἔνεκα μενας, ἐπει κατέβησαν, ἦφει κάτω τὰ δπλα καὶ βαλών ἀπαντα τελευταῖος ἀπεσψήστο καὶ αὐτός.

Frontinus, *Strateg.*, I. v. 21: Idem (scil. Spartacus) in Vesuvio obssessus, ea parte qua mons asperrimus erat ideoque incustoditus ex vimine silvestri catenas conseruit, quibus demissus non solum evasit verum etiam ex alio latere Clodium ita terruit, —. (The punctuation is mine; here too the Loeb Library's text and translation require revision.)

These passages make the topographical framework for the manoeuvre quite clear: the gladiators were inside the (for the time) extinct crater; at one point in the rim of the crater there

was a break (the *fauces* of Florus); this was blocked by the Roman troops; the gladiators, by means of rope ladders made from vines, lowered themselves down the outer slopes of the mountain at other points, as far as its base (*ad imas eius radices*), and since their escape had not been observed (*exitu inviso*) they were able to take by a surprise attack the camp of the general, who was anticipating nothing of the sort.

The text of Florus is to be restored by putting a comma, not after *Glabro*, but after *montis*. A second comma may be placed after *radices*, breaking the sentence into three suitable subdivisions.

A. W. VAN BUREN.

AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME.

REPORTS.

MNEMOSYNE vol. 58, parts 1 & 2.

Pp. 1-12. P. H. Damsté, ad Ammianum Marcellinum. Textual emendation of 40 passages from books 21 to 28 inclusive.

Pp. 13-19. U. Ph. Boissevain, ad inscriptionem in arce Argorum repartam. A further commentary on some parts of the inscription published by Vollgraff in *Mnemosyne* 57, pp. 206 ff.

Pp. 20-40. Guilielmus Vollgraff, ad titulos Argivos. (a) Interpretation of an inscription on a helmet in the British Museum (I. G. A. 32; cf. Newton, *Inscr. Brit. Mus.* II, CXXXVII and Buck, *Greek Dial.*² p. 241, 80) in the light of I. G. IV, 492 and I. G. I² 394. (b) In the inscription represented by Schwyzer, *Ex. Epigr.* 317, the author considers *ἐποίεε* imperfect, not aorist, disagreeing with Bechtel, *Griech. Dial.* II p. 463. (c) The probable date of I. G. IV 554. (d) In I. G. IV 517, the absence of a final *v* from a word preceding a word beginning with a vowel can be explained linguistically and need not be attributed to the stonecutter. (e) I. G. IV 561, a relative pronoun seems to have been omitted through haplology. (f) An inscription published in J. H. S. XLVI p. 253 indicates through a corrected error that its artisan was probably from Tegea. (g) The inscription noted by Schwyzer, *Ex. Epigr.* 89, should be ascribed to the middle of the fourth century B. C. (h) The proper names *Εὐτέρας* and *Εὐτηρίδας* are to be connected with *τέρας*, *τέρεα* rather than with *τηρός*. (i) An attempt to restore I. G. IV 487, 488. (j) In the inscription published in B. C. H. 1903 p. 264, 9, the name *Αἰολάω* is not to be derived from a town *Αἰόλα* but is comparable to such a name as *Ακονσίλαος*. (k) The inscription in B. C. H. 1904 p. 427, 9, interpreted in the light of I. G. V 1, 1156. (l) Interpretation of the inscription in B. C. H. 1909 p. 458. (m) Additional note on the author's article in *Mnemosyne* 47 p. 167. (n) I. G. IV, I² 69, 2.

Pp. 41-44. J. van Ijzeren, ad Theophrasti religiosum. Emendation of a passage not treated by Bolkestein.

Pp. 45-53. B. A. van Groningen, XAPAKTHPES. An investigation into the meaning of the word and its applicability to Theophrastus' work.

Pp. 54-57. B. A. van Groningen, ad Theophrasti Characteres. Commentary on passages in chapters 2 and 3.

Pp. 58-73. L. A. W. C. Venmans, Σέρφος. The author believes that termites first entered the Mediterranean lands in post-classical times; that the original significance of the word

was an animal of the worm type rather than the gnat or ant type; that the word is etymologically connected with *ἔρπειν*.

Pp. 74-78. B. A. van Groningen, de Archilochi fragmento secundo. In this distich the author takes *μεμαγμένη* and *Ίσμαρικός* to be predicates and figurative. *ἐν δορὶ* means "on guard duty"; the end of the couplet contains an oxymoron: "cum vigilo, vinum bibo velutsi in trielinio quiescerem."

Pp. 79-88. C. Brakman, I. f., ad Plinii Nat. Hist. lib. XII-XXIV. Textual emendation and commentary.

Pp. 89-93. F. Muller, J. f., de Caeculo Praenestis conditore. Caeculus is to be thought of as a second Prometheus, a demon of fire. The name is probably cognate with Cācus. That these should be appropriate inhabitants of Praeneste is evident when the geological composition of the region is considered; cf. A. Philipson, "Das Mittelmeergebiet,"³ p. 25.

P. 93. v. Gr., ad Aeschyli fr. 226 Nauck. Punctuate as a question; write *ἔστι*, not *ἐστι*.

Pp. 94-98. F. Muller, J. f., de voce Latina "comfriva" (?) This word is found in a gloss on Terence, Andria, 88. Perhaps it should be read *confrusam*; this is perhaps connected with *frustum*. The definition would then be: "cena ex variis frustis sive sportulis composita."

P. 99. C. Brakman, I. f., emendatur Calpurn. eclog. IV 153. Read *situm* for *sonant*.

Pp. 100-112. J. H. Thiel, de Lucretio puerorum vitae descriptore. The following passages among others are examined: 5, 222 ff., 2, 576 ff., 4, 400 ff., 2, 55 ff., 1, 936 ff. The author compares Lucretius' feeling for the young with that of Euripides.

Pp. 112-113. J. H. Thiel, ad Verg. ecl. 4, 60 ff. The passage is compared with Herodotus 5, 92 γ. (The author reads *qui* in line 62, not *cui*.)

Pp. 114-120. E. H. Renkema, ad Plauti Trinumnum. Commentary on verses 411-420, 425-429, 635, 641-646.

Pp. 121-133. K. van der Heyde, plus, minus, amplius, longius. The use of these comparatives in apposition (plus decem viri) and with the ablative is examined in Plautus, Terence, Caecilius Statius, Cato, S. C. de Bacchanalibus, Twelve Tables, etc. The appositive use is not an outgrowth of that with the ablative.

P. 134. v. Gr., ad Aeschyli *Κῆρυκας*. Fragments 104 and 105 lead one to think of Heracles; cf. Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* II

67—4, 11. If there were two or three messengers in the play, all but one were probably mute.

Pp. 135-136. H. I. Rose, ad Caesaris Belli Gallici VI 21, 5. The beliefs of the Germani concerning the detection of unchastity compared with those of the present day Papuans.

Pp. 137-159. A. Wagenvoort, de Vergili Ecloga prima. Vergil's "realism" in the first Eclogue with some passages from the *Culex*; Tityrus did not think of Octavian as one of the Lares but as his own proper tutelary Lar familiaris; Tucker's interpretation of lines 67-69 is endorsed (cf. Class. Rev. 22 p. 244), with an added suggestion as to punctuation; the author believes that *admetiri in schol.* Dan. on Eclogue 9, 10 means that the tract of water there mentioned is in addition to and not included within the three measured miles of land; Eclogue 1, Catalepton 8, and Eclogue 9 were composed in this order.

Pp. 160-165. A. G. Roos, de titulo quodam Latino Corinthi nuper reperto. This inscription was published by de Waele in *Mededeelingen van het Nederlandsch Historisch Instituut te Rome*, 1929, pp. 40 ff. The "Erastus" mentioned in the inscription is not St. Paul's friend (cf. Romans 16, 23). The abbreviation *pro aed* is for *pro aed(ilitate)* or possibly *pro aed(ilitatis) [honore]*.

Pp. 166-206. J. C. Naber, observatiunculae de iure Romano. De proprietatis intellectu oratio tripertita. De exceptione rei donatae et traditae et de constitutione Rutiliana. De chirographis et syngraphis. De in iure cessione et confessione. Elenchus fontium.

Pp. 207-222. C. Brakman, ad Plinii Nat. Hist. lib. 26-37. Textual emendations; grammatical observations; remarks on cases, prepositions, adverbs, conjunctions, clausulae, colloquialisms.

CLAYTON M. HALL.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY.

ROMANIA, Vol. LIV (1928), juillet-octobre.

Pp. 321-356. Joseph Bédier. La tradition manuscrite du *Lai de l'ombre*; réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes. Deuxième article. III. Examen de la nouvelle méthode. Conclusions. The author here presents eleven schemes for the relationship of the seven known manuscripts, and proceeds to carefully weigh the evidence for each one of them in an attempt to discover the validity of the new method recently suggested by Dom Quentin. The main point of the discussion is whether it is preferable to base a critical text on the seemingly best manuscript, or whether the editor should attempt to establish a

composite text by means of a comparison of variant readings. His conclusion is that the canons of criticism applicable to Greek and Latin classical texts differ widely from those for Mediæval texts. The modern editor of the latter will do best to rely on his own mature judgment in each individual case.

Pp. 357-380. Ferdinand Lot. Études sur les légendes épiques françaises. V. La Chanson de Roland; à propos d'un livre récent. In his book entitled *Du nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland* P. Boissonnade has advanced certain new theories concerning the influence of the Crusades, and he has attempted to identify a large number of the places mentioned in the poem. The date and origin of this celebrated work are also discussed.

Pp. 381-412. Albert Sjögren. Le genre des mots d'emprunt norrois en normand. Under two main headings and many subdivisions a large number of etymologies of supposedly Norse origin are here discussed.

Pp. 413-426. Arthur Långfors. Notice du manuscrit français 9220 de la Bibliothèque nationale. Quatrains français sur le trône de Salomon; La vision de Saint Paul; Vers latins du Miroir de vie et de mort, etc. This article is an expansion in some detail of the brief notice published in the official catalogue in 1895, and one French text is published in extenso.

Pp. 427-452. Jean Boutière. Peire Bremon lo Tort. As external evidence concerning this poet is almost entirely wanting, we are restricted to that afforded by two of his poems that have survived the centuries. These are intimately connected, and they appear to have been written in Syria during one of the Crusades. A critical edition of the two poems is finally given.

Pp. 453-464. Vittorio Bertoldi. Nomi alpini del luppolo. A Classical Latin background for this group of Italian dialect words is lacking; therefore the attempt is here made to partially supply this deficiency from an etymological standpoint by an investigation of the geographical distribution of the numerous dialectic forms in use in the Alpine region.

Pp. 465-475. Thomas Walton. Notes sur le manuscrit 871 de la Bibliothèque municipale de Grenoble. This volume is a collection of moral pieces similar to many others formed in the fifteenth century. It is in fact made up of three distinct manuscripts all copied during that period. Especial attention is here paid to a poem entitled *Vie de Fleurence de Rome*.

Pp. 476-514. Mélanges. Pp. 515-526. Discussions. Pp. 527-566. Comptes rendus. Pp. 567-605. Périodiques. Pp. 606-620. Chronique. Pp. 621-628. Table des matières.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

WASHINGTON.

GLOTTA, XIX (1930), 1/2.

Pp. 1-15. Max Niedermann, Zur lateinischen und griechischen Wortgeschichte. Latin *architectus* is a back-formation from *architectari*, for **architeconari* to Gk. *ἀρχιτέκτων*, with haplological loss in **architeconantur* *-onantem etc. Latin *furcula* from **furg-klā* (from **tlā*) to root in Lith. *žergti* 'die Beine spreizen'; *furca* is a back-formation. Latin *ora*, originally 'mooring-line' as in Liv. XXII, 19, 10; from 'rope' as dividing line or boundary came *ora* 'shore, coast.' Greek *ἄκαλανθος* 'a kind of bird' is by metathesis from **ἄκανθαλίς*, to *ἄκανθα*, with the suffix of *συκαλίς* 'Feigendrossel,' *πυρράλίς* 'a kind of dove.' Greek *ἄκαστος*, *πλατάνιστος*, and place names like *Κάρυστος* are collectives denoting places overgrown with vegetation of a specific kind; the suffix as in Latin *arbustum*, *filiatum*.

Pp. 16-24. Otto Immisch, *Ignoscere*. This word gets its meaning 'pardon' as an early translation of Greek *συγγνώμη* and its kin, taking the negative prefix as an opposite to *cognoscere*; it denotes 'Verzicht' (cf. Germ. *verzeihen*) and not 'Einsicht' (with in- 'into'), for the Romans were not introspective.

Pp. 24-48. Franz Altheim, *Die neuesten Forschungen zur Vorgeschichte der römischen Metrik*, building on the work of Fraenkel and others, argues that the Romans must have had iambic and trochaic measures before Livius Andronicus, since otherwise these rhythms could not have reached their acme at Rome within fifty years from his first plays in 241. He finds an old iambic *senarius* quoted by Gell. IV, 5, probably from the *Annales Maximi* of the pontifices, also one quoted in a fragment of the *Faeneratrix* of Plautus. The Greek *tragi-comedy* of South Italy was probably the intermediary of the trochaic tetrameter from the Attic Old Comedy to the Oscan *Atellanae*, whence it passed to the Romans, becoming the trochaic *septenarius* in the process.

Pp. 48-72. Edwin Müller-Graupa, *Primitiae* (cont. from *Glotta XVIII*, 132 ff.). Latin *peccare* 'to sin' is denominative from native Italic word *pedicum* 'gout', attested Lucil. ap. C. G. L. IV, 18; the fragment is to be read (against Marx) *pēdīcum iam/excoquit omne*; cf. *mancus* 'maimed' to *manica* 'manacle', *manus* 'hand' (cf. Gm. *Gicht* to *gehen*, = 'Gang'). Appendix on semantics of words meaning 'sin', and on *φθειρίασις*. *Superstes* is euphemism for 'netherworld demon', applied to spirits of the dead going around as ghosts, and *superstitio* was by origin 'Dämonenwesen, Dämonen- Gespenster-glaube'. *Scortum* 'hide, leather', as applied to persons, was merely a synecdoche, specialized without particular reason to denote 'harlot'. *Lac*, *γάλα* came from an onomatopoetic root *glag-* *glak-*, indicat-

ing the noise of drinking from the mother's breast; with a rich collection of other onomatopoeias of similar meanings.

Pp. 72-85. Josef Zingerle, Lexikalische Beiträge. Studies in new Greek words and meanings found in inscriptions and papyri, and not yet accepted into the lexica, or wrongly so accepted: ἀκοντιστήρ, poetic doublet of ἀκοντιστής, in a fragmentary inscription of Lydian Tire (Denkschr. Ak. Wien LVII, 88), has the new meaning 'fountain-mouth which throws the water upward'. Δώμηρα, in the Cnidian epigram Kaibel EG 204, is an error for δώρημα. Ἐπαίξω, in Hippocr. p. 15, c. 19, is a late formation for ἐπαίσσω. Εὐκνονάξω in I. G. R. III, 1339, is miswritten for εὐκονάξω. Κριπδάριος is shown to be the Greek transcription of Latin crepidarius, by its use as a personal name in a Christian inscription Eph. Arch. 1915, p. 81. Παλεστρατιώτης, with παλε- graphic for παλαι-, is a single word, despite editorial division in I. G. R. III, 213 and 1489, since 213 is a bilingual and the Latin text shows that the word is a translation of veteranus. Παράψιμον in Leyden magical papyrus V (II, 23), is an Egyptian writing for παράσημον. Σιδηροκόντρα, in I. G. R. III, 360, is a correct reading, cf. κοντρο- 'hunting-spear' as prius in a compound C. I. G. 3422, a contamination of κέντρον 'goad' and κοντός 'pole' (= Latin contus).

Pp. 85-89. W. Prellwitz, Zur griechischen Etymologie. Ἐτάξω is formed to *hetos 'wahr, gut', cf. ἐτέος, to root es- in zero grade. Ἐτ-οῖμος 'guten Weg habend, bereit', cf. οῖμος 'Weg, Bahn', to root ei- 'go'. Ἐτ-απός 'guter, wahrer Freund', with root ar- 'fügen', as in ἀρθμός 'Freundschaft', ἐτ-αῖρος, the same with *aryos, Skt. aryā- 'freundlich, hold, treu, fromm, arisch': important for the I. E. quality of the Greeks, since from this root in ἀρέσκω came the abstract ἀρέτή 'das Gutsein, Tugend' (and not from *nr-, seen in ἀνήρ).

Pp. 89-127. W. Prellwitz, Hervorhebende Partikeln in der indogermanischen Wortbildung. Διπαρής from λίαν παρεῖναι; so Herodian, who was right, though *παρής from παρεῖναι has been denied by scholars; yet from root es- as independent semantic unit (not as auxiliary merely) come Skt. sat- 'good', Greek ἔν, ἥν, ὑ- in ὑγίης, Latin er-us 'Herr', sent-ire, sent-entia, sin-cērus 'having a good heart' (cf. κῆρ 'heart'). Δι- for λίαν is an emphatic particle. So also *ān *ēn *ōn, varying with *ā *ē *ō (in Latin -n became -m); this is attached notably to prepositions and adverbs: σαφής and Dor. σαφ-āν-ής Att. σαφηνής; ὑπερ-ή-φανος; Goth. ufar-ō; Αθ-āν-ā, cf. for prius Skt. adhi, Eng. under; Latin id-ōn-eus, mātr-ōn-a, quispi-am, i-am, quoni-am, and prefix ā, as in Skt. ā-pita- 'yellowish', Lith. o-balsis 'watchword', ḷ-νεκές 'μακρόν' (Hesych.), Att. δι-ā-νεκής. So also *ai, as in Greek

īn-ai, Latin *pr-ae*, Lith. *voc. tēvai*, for *tēve*, verb *yrai* for *yra*, pron. *jis-ai* for *jis*. Particle **epi *pi* in Greek intensive prefix, as in *ἐπι-εικῆς*, *ἐπ-ει*, in Latin *quip-pe*, Skt. *kim api* 'sehr', Latin *quis-pi-am*.

Pp. 127-148. F. Conrad, *Die Deminutiva im Altlatein. I. Die Deminutiva bei Plautus*, with a complete alphabetical list of the words and of their occurrences. With few exceptions Plautus used diminutives not for the sake of denoting small size, but for other reasons: affection or distaste, pleasure or dislike. Classification of the diminutives into semantically kindred groups. (To be continued.)

Pp. 148-150. Hans Krahe, *Zum oskischen Dialekt von Bantia*, attributes to a Messapian substrate the Bantian palatalizations *ri* > *r*, *ti* > *s*, *di* > *z*, *ki* > *x*, whereas the Oscan of other localities at most doubled consonants before *i*. For Messapian shows *ti* > *θ*, *li* > *ll*, *ri* > *rr*, *di* > *dd*, though not the change of *ki* (cf. *Glotta XVII*, 81 ff.).

Pp. 151-152. W. Kroll, *Metrische lateinische Inschrift aus Tripolitana*, gives a revised reading, after a photograph, of an inscription found at the Libyan oasis Bonjem (cf. Lavagnini, *Riv. di Fil. N. S. VI*, 416; Bartoccini, *Africa italiana*, II, 54), an acrostich of Q. Avidius Quintanus, in senarii, good for the time (soon before 198 A. D.); it contains a praise of the waters of Salus, in which the centurion and his soldiers refreshed themselves by swimming.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

REVIEWS.

LÉON HERRMANN. *Les Masques et les Visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile.* Bruxelles, Éditions de la Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles, MCMXXX. 198 pp.

The object of this study is to explain the personal allusions in Virgil's Eclogues. The author regards the Eclogues as a sort of pastoral comedy, a sort of literary masquerade, in which each pseudonym represents some real person of Virgil's day. Moreover, he insists that they are a group of connected poems, in which each pseudonym must represent a single person only. Thus, if Menalcas is Virgil in Ecl. V and IX, Menalcas must be Virgil in II, III, X, as well. And none of the other pseudonyms can refer to Virgil.

This reasoning leads to a novel explanation of the First Eclogue. M. HERRMANN holds that the order of composition of these poems is simply the traditional order in which they stand in the MSS. The First was written before October of the year 41, and somehow refers back to an event of the year 49. It has nothing to do with the district of Mantua, but with that of Tusculum. The exiled Meliboeus is identified as the poet P. Valerius Cato, and Tityrus as Q. Caecilius Epirota. The 'deus' of line 6 is Julius Caesar.

In the Second Eclogue Corydon is identified as Valgius Rufus; Iollas, as C. Cilnius Maecenas. In the Fifth, and elsewhere, Daphnis represents the poet Catullus. Other identifications offered, with more or less confidence, are Alphesiboeus (L. Varius Rufus), Amyntas (Albius Tibullus), Damon (Licinius Calvus), Lycidas (Q. Horatius Flaccus), Moeris (Aemilius Macer), Mopsus (Domitius Marsus). For the complete list, see pages 173-174.

A special chapter is devoted to the 'puer' of the Fourth Eclogue. Here the author records his vote in favor of the young Marcellus (of Aen. vi. 861) whose birth he would set as late as the year 40. The poem itself is derived mainly from Catullus (LXIV), Theocritus, and Hesiod. No influence of Sibylline prophecy is admitted; 'Cumaeum carmen' means only the poem of Cyme, Hesiod's Works and Days. And all modern suggestions of Orphic, Mithraic, or Messianic mysticism are cheerfully swept aside.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Index Rerum et Nominum in Scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati
Tractatorum: Confecerunt J. F. MOUNTFORD et J. T.
SCHULTZ. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, vol.
XXIII, 1930. 217 pp. \$3.00.

Everyone who has had to deal with the Servian Commentary on Virgil will be grateful for this long-needed index. It is well made, well arranged, and well printed. For the special benefit of those who are interested in the relation of Servius to Donatus, it includes the names and subjects mentioned in Donatus' Commentary on Terence. It is made from the two standard editions, Thilo's Servius (1881-7) and Wessner's Donatus (1902-5).

W. P. MUSTARD.

Arte Poetica di Orazio. Introduzione e Commento di AUGUSTO
ROSTAGNI. Torino, Chiantore, MCMXXX. Pp. cxii +
133. Lire 28.

Professor ROSTAGNI has done well to re-edit the *Ars Poetica* in the light of his own and other recent studies of the general subject. He insists that it is really a systematic treatise, on the plan of the Greek *τέχναι*. It is almost exclusively concerned with dramatic poetry, but so was Aristotle's *Poetics*. Its special model was the *Τέχνη* of Neoptolemus of Parium, as Porphyrio stated long ago. Hence its general plan: 1-41 (*ποίησις*), 42-294 (*ποίημα*), 295-476 (*ποιητής*). It seems to have been written about 15 B. C., a little earlier than Epist. ii. 2 (to Augustus). The editor's discussion of ancient treatises on poetry, from Aristotle to Horace, is especially interesting and useful.

W. P. MUSTARD.

Storia della Letteratura Latina nelle Età Repubblicana e Augustea. Per cura di VINCENZO USSANI. Milano, Vallardi, 1929. 525 pp. 55 Lire.

It is a pleasant duty to make prompt mention of this learned volume by the Professor of Latin Literature in the University of Rome. Professor USSANI takes up his subject from the origins, and carries it on to the close of the Augustan age. Throughout the volume he insists upon the permanence of the Roman type, and wisely emphasizes the national aspects of the literature; for, as Professor WIGHT DUFF has put it, "the Roman borrowed in a Roman way." His critical judgments are regularly sound and

well expressed, and one gets the pleasant impression that they are based on his own reading of the authors concerned, and that they are all his own. This in spite of a most laudable familiarity with the 'literature' of his subject—Italian, French, German, English, and American. A few of his longer illustrative passages are rendered in Italian verse.

On p. 242 F. Marx's argument that Lucretius was probably a Celt of freedman standing should now be reconsidered, in view of Professor TENNEY FRANK's recent comments, *Studies in Honor of Hermann Collitz*, Baltimore, 1930, pp. 63-66. So, too, on p. 321, the suggestion of a Celtic origin for Virgil, and a Celtic temperament, seems to call for more evidence than has yet been adduced, and at least some explanation of what a Celtic temperament is supposed to be. And, p. 379, was Ovid's daughter really the poetess Perilla?

W. P. MUSTARD.

Maphaeus Vegius and his Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid: A Chapter on Virgil in the Renaissance. By ANNA COX BRINTON. Stanford University Press, 1930. xii + 183 pp. \$7.50.

This sumptuous volume is a most interesting contribution to the celebration of the two-thousandth anniversary of Virgil's birth. It begins with a well written introduction, on the life and work of Vegius, and the amazing history of his 'Thirteenth Book.' The Latin text is based on the rare *editio princeps* of Venice, 1471, and is here printed on alternate pages with the English version by Thomas Twyne, London, 1584. There is included also the Scottish translation by Gawain Douglas written in 1513, and reproductions of six delightful woodcuts from Sebastian Brant's famous *Virgil*, Strassburg, 1502. The notes are mainly concerned with Vegius's use of his classical models.

There are a few misprints in the Latin text: line 67, *magum*, for *magnum*; 157, *pacis*, for *paci*; 190, *sublimen*, for *sublimem*; 206, *effundisse*, for *effudisse*. The colophon quoted on p. 50 is rather puzzling. *Mincidae* is probably a misprint for *Min-ciadae*. And surely the strange word *sesquique* does not represent what the writer meant to say. *Parvo numerosa iuventus* hardly suggests "an extremely small edition."

A few additional parallels from Virgil and Ovid might have been cited in the notes: on line 290, Ovid, *Her.* 1, 24, *versa est in cineres sospite Troia viro*; on 291, Virg. *G.* 1, 406, *secat aethera pennis*; on 325, *Aen.* 7, 668, *tecta subibat*; on 364, *Aen.* 6, 307, *pueri innuptaeque puellae*; on 374, Ovid, *M.* 1, 566, *finierat Paean*; on 485, *Aen.* 5, 368, *nec mora*; on 612, Ovid, *M.*

8, 67, *stat sententia*. And there are two good books which might have been mentioned in the bibliography: Vladimiro Zabughin's *Vergilio nel Rinascimento Italiano*, vol. I, Bologna, 1921, and Lauchlan MacLean Watt's *Douglas's Aeneid*, Cambridge, 1920.

W. P. MUSTARD.

Descensus Averno: Fourteen Woodcuts reproduced from Sebastian Brant's Virgil, Strassburg, MDII. Elucidated and provided with a Foreword by ANNA COX BRINTON. Stanford University Press, 1930. \$3.50.

This is a very sumptuous reproduction of a famous set of woodcuts made to illustrate the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*. After the fashion of the time many of the leading personages are indicated by streamers, and the editor helps to identify others. One corner of No. X is explained as depicting Pirithous and the eldest Fury. But the 'Fury' is surely a Harpy. In the description of No. VII, for Cerberus' monstrous 'bulls' read 'bulk'. The extracts from Brant's prologue and colophon are for some reason given only in English verse.

W. P. MUSTARD.

Chateaubriand and Virgil. By LOUIS HASTINGS NAYLOR. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930. xiv + 212 pp. \$1.50.

This scholarly and workmanlike monograph sets forth the persistent use of Virgilian phrase and fancy in Chateaubriand's prose. One further instance might have been indicated on p. 65: "des boeufs de Clitumne qui traînaient madame l'Ambassadrice à son triomphe." This alludes to Geor. ii, 146-8, *hinc albi, Clitumne, greges . . . Romanos ad tempa deum duxere triumphos*. On p. 130 the fancy "des ruisseaux de lait s'égarant au sein de la terre, lorsque les hommes avaient leur innocence" is perhaps due to Ovid, rather than to Virgil. Compare the description of the Golden Age, Met. i, 111, *flumina iam lactis, iam flumina nectaris ibant*.

W. P. MUSTARD.

The Essays of Montaigne, translated by GEORGE B. IVES. Introductions by Grace Norton. 4 vols. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1925.

The thought of a new English version of Montaigne opens prospects of many delights. Florio and Cotton are, to the

reviewer's way of thinking, each as successful as any translators ever are. Both have made books which are not only English but literature. Yet both obviously date. Florio especially is too redolent of the rich soil of pre-Shakespearian rhetoric to be utterly faithful to the spirit of his French original. Cotton seems to modern minds less old-fashioned and certainly more literal than his predecessor, but after all his translation is now some two hundred odd years old and it is natural that one should feel the need of a version in contemporary English.

But that need finds little satisfaction in the Ives translation which the publishers modestly predict will become the standard text. Its faults are many, but its greatest fault, because the least excusable, is its prudishness. Why remind readers of this journal that Montaigne was not inspired by the ideals of the late Anthony Comstock? He recognized the existence of all our instincts and organs, even those necessary for the continuance of the race. Mr. Ives and Miss Norton feel apparently that their author should have had the benefits of a New England training. Miss Norton genteelly rebukes him for saying, "Non pudet dicere, quod non pudet sentire" (Vol. IV 3). As if he could have written the *Essays* at all without believing that. He said it and he lived up to it and the course of good taste would have been either to translate him entirely, as Cotton seems to have done, or not to have translated him at all.

Instead of taking the courageous path, Mr. Ives leaves passages which he deems improper in the original French. Consequently most of the essay "On Certain Verses of Vergil" and whole pages out of others glare at one indecently as they would never have done in English. One has only to turn to Cotton's translation to see how much more palatable a frank handling of the situation is.

Not only is the translation purposely incomplete, but on almost every page are awkwardness and infelicity. What sense does this passage make: "It is the quality of a porter, not of merit, to have stouter arms and legs" (Bk. I, ch. 31; Vol. I 281)? Or this: "A notably beautiful thing in their marriages is that the same eagerness that our wives have to keep us from the friendship and goodwill of other women, theirs have to an equal degree to obtain this for their husbands" (*Id.*; Vol. I 283 f.)? Is this modern English: "From the inconstancy of the varying dance of fortune, she shows us every kind of aspect" (Bk. I, ch. 34; Vol. I 292)? Is this: "There is nothing so burdensome, so hard to please, as abundance" (Bk. I, ch. 42; Vol. I 348)? Or this: "But however it may be, Nature has not more privileged us in this matter than otherwise regarding her universal laws" (Bk. II, ch. 12; Vol. II 241)? Excuses can be

made for all these sentences, to be sure, but why write so affected and mannered an English that it need excuses?

Although one can find fault with Mr. Ives's translation of Montaigne, one can only admire the courage that produced it. Unfortunately one needs more than moral qualities to create a work of art. That something more is scandalously absent in these elegant and costly volumes.

GEORGE BOAS.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Platonis Epistulae Commentariis Illustratae. By FRANCISCUS NOVOTNÝ. Brno, 1930. Pp. vii + 319.

It is nearly a quarter of a century since Professor Novotný challenged the prevailing view that the Platonic *Epistles* were spurious by publishing certain stylometric studies.¹ Since that time it has become fashionable to accept at least the seventh and eighth as genuine. Professor Novotný in this commentary proceeds on the assumption that all but the first are from Plato's hand. It is to be hoped that future students of the *Epistles* will not neglect his work, for his well chosen parallels and sound observations will save them from many of the mistakes of which translators, including the present writer, have been guilty. He has done his work thoroughly, and when he fails to note previous suggestions it is usually because they do not deserve notice. He has brought forward much new evidence and has cleared up a number of doubtful points. There will always of course remain passages where other scholars will prefer their own interpretation.

The text, which occupies pages 1-48, differs from Burnet's, if we include punctuation, in forty-two places, which are listed in a conspectus. Many of these are improvements, but the editor does not realize the importance of the marginal notes in the manuscripts A and O. The tenth-century editors of these manuscripts were able and conscientious and had at hand an abundance of evidence that it is perverse for a modern editor to exclude. Novotný rejects two such marginal supplements at 328b. This is anything but conservative. Homoeoteleuton explains both omissions, while there is no explanation of the notes as arbitrary additions. The first sentence can, as Novotný shows, be read without $\eta\thetaos$; why then should an editor have inserted the word unless he found it in a manuscript? Given $\tau\bar{\eta}s\psi\chi\bar{\eta}s$, which in itself vitiates the correspondence of clauses, we are much better off with $\eta\thetaos$. It is of course governed by $\pi\acute{e}pti$. The

¹ Listy filologické, 33 (1906), pp. 193-120, 336-347.

expression *ἡθος ψυχῆς* is found five times in the *Laws* and elsewhere in this epistle at 334d.

I append a few notes. 316a 3: For another view of the meaning of *προοίμια νόμων* here see an article of mine in the Transactions of the American Philological Association 60 (1929), pp. 5-24. 317d 2: The expression *οἱ πρὸς ἥδονήν μετὰ αἰσχρᾶς βλάβης ὅμιλοιντες* is a periphrasis for *κόλακες*, a word that Plato avoids as unseemly. Compare *Laws* 5, 743d, where *βοσκήματα αἰσχρά* is a euphemism for *πόρναι* (cf. *πορνοβοσκός*) that has puzzled more than one reader. 324b 6: For *νέω καὶ μὴ νέω* compare Lysias 6. 32. 345c 2: For *ἡγεμῶν καὶ κύριος* compare Demosthenes 18, 201. 344c 2: For *πολλοῦ δεῖ μὴ* construed like *οὐ μὴ* compare *Gorgias* 517a 6. 326b 9: It is perhaps worth suggesting that *μόνον* might well be an adverb here, that Plato may be protesting against the custom of taking a siesta, of 'never sleeping by night only.' That this was a custom of which Plato disapproved we know from *Phaedrus* 259a. The other custom to which Plato takes exception in this passage, that of taking two full meals a day, fits in naturally with the habit of sleeping at noon. Cicero to be sure (Tusc. 5, 100) renders: *nec umquam pernoctare solum*, and Sallust (Suas. 1, 8) adapts: *nullam noctem sine scorto quiescere*, but both have introduced ideas that are not in the Greek. Never sleeping alone was not a new custom in Greece. Zeus in the Iliad never sleeps alone, I believe. Probably most husbands followed his example. Furthermore the word *νύκτωρ* is superfluous unless Plato has in mind the habit of sleeping by day. The passage is in any case ambiguous and well illustrates the need of caution and intuition in an interpreter of the Epistles. Professor Novotný fortunately has both.

L. A. POST.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE, HAVERFORD, PA.

Körperkultur im Altertum. By Julius Jüthner (Jena, G. Fischer, 1928). Pp. 76 and 26 Text-cuts.

This little brochure in the field of cultural history forms Vol. XII of the series *Jenaer medizin-historische Beiträge*, edited by Dr. Theodor Meyer-Steinig. It is a comprehensive account of physical culture in antiquity in relation to health—exercise, baths, rubbing and massage, use of oil and sand, methods of cleansing, dietetics, etc.—to 393 A. D., when Theodosius I, because of the adverse influence of the State Church, ended organized Greek athletics by closing the Olympic Games. The illustrations are taken from various monuments—vases, reliefs, mirrors, wall-paintings, statues, etc. The author, a Professor

at Innsbruck, has long been known for his contributions to ancient sports, especially for his two standard works, *Über antike Turngeräthe* (1896) and edition of Philostratos' *Über Gymnastik* (1909).

After a few introductory pages devoted to the slight attention paid to physical exercise by the Oriental nations and especially Crete, "the cradle of gymnastics," the book is concerned with Greek athletics beginning with Homer and the inception of the Pan-hellenic Games. While the Epic tells us much of sports and of the use of oil and the bath—the Homeric *asamintus*, bath-tub, being a Minoan loan-word—it was the Dorian Greeks who instituted historical Greek athletics by their innovations—nudity, use of oil and sweat-bath, and admission of girls to such gymnastic contests as running, wrestling, discus- and spear-throwing. Orsippus, the Megarian stadiodrome, was the first to lay aside the loin-cloth at Olympia in 720 B. C., and the Spartan sweat-bath survived as the *Laconicum* (*sc. balneum*) at Rome, first mentioned by Cicero and Vitruvius. Herodotus also records that the Scythians of his day were inordinately fond of the steam-bath, and Theophrastus is known to have composed a treatise on "Sweating." The Spartan innovations were soon introduced into Athens and elsewhere, Athenian athletes appearing at Olympia by 696 B. C. By the fifth century B. C. the two institutions for physical culture, viz. the training-schools (*gymnasia* and *palaestrae*) and baths, had become Pan-hellenic. While Plato in the fourth century called physical culture "gymnastic" and the "sister art" to medicine, Erasistratus, the founder of a medical school in Alexandria, in the next century called it "hygiene." Alexander spread Greek athletics over Persia and by 186 B. C., after much opposition because of their supposed un-military character, they got a foothold in Rome. By 33 B. C. there were 170 baths in Rome alone. The earlier emperors instituted various athletic festivals, but the old Roman interest in gladiator-, beast-, and sea-fights was sure to cause the decline of Greek sports there, whose only survivors were boxing, carried on in a peculiarly Roman spirit as a bloody sport with a cestus of metal, and the pancratium.

Jüthner shows that it was Christianity which was to blame for the disappearance of Greek athletics. While the early Fathers, *e. g.*, Clement of Alexandria, c. 200 A. D., who were the products of the heathen conditions which had fostered athletics, stood for their moderate use, even countenancing nudity and advocating the bath for health and cleanliness, the fourth-century teachers, even the pagan Libanius and Himerius, opposed them, and the new religion, with its enmity to earthly things, was bound to frown upon this survival of paganism. St. Pachomius, the Egyptian monk who founded the Christian cenobitical life and who

died around 346, began the active fight against the gymnasium by forbidding his monks the use of oil and body baths. When Constantine made Christianity the court religion—not the State religion, as is stated on p. 67—its policy was directed thenceforth openly against everything heathen, including athletic festivals and contests, until finally Theodosius gave them their *coup de grâce* and they disappeared until the revival of athletic sports in our day.

However, one phase of the old "hygiene" survived—the bath. While Havelock Ellis is quite right in saying that the bath disappeared in the West with the dissolution of the Western Empire, Jüthner makes it clear that it lived on throughout the Byzantine epoch in the Eastern monasteries, where, despite the strenuous rules of life, it played an important rôle, and probably to an even greater degree among the laity. Thus, he cites several ruins of ancient baths, one found within the walls of the Monastery of the Panagia on Cithaeron dating from the eleventh century. Here are the remains of a building with three rooms, two of which were fitted with heating apparatus beneath the floors and inside the walls, thus corresponding with the early imperial *tepidarium* and *caldarium*, while the third was for the exit of the conduits. It was in the East that the Crusaders learned of the ancient institution and made it known to the West. But it was the immediate heirs of Constantinople, the Turks and Russians, who expanded the hot-air bath in the nineteenth century so that the "Turkish" and "Russian" baths of to-day form the last survival of the Greco-Roman bath.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

L'Acropole. Revue du monde hellénique. Tome V, Fasc. 1-2. Nos. 17-18. Janvier-Juin. 1930. Paris, *Librairie Guillaume Budé*. 144 pp. 80.

Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists. With an English Translation by Charles Burton Gulick. In seven volumes. Vol. IV. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1930. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 235.)

Bellinger (Alfred R.) Catalogue of the Coins found at Corinth. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1930. xii + 95 pp. \$2.00.

Bollettino dell'Associazione internazionale per gli Studi Mediterranei. Primo numero Virgiliano. Anno I. Ottobre, 1930. Num. 4. Roma, *Villa Celimontana*. Pp. 32.

Bonner (Campbell). The Numerical Value of a Magical Formula. Reprinted from The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, Volume XVI, Parts I and II, 1930. Great Britain. 4°.

Brecht (Franz Josef). Motiv- und Typengeschichte des griechischen Spottepiagramms. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1930. 114 pp. (Philologus, Supplementband XXII, Heft II.) Unbound 8.50 M., bound 10 M.

Brinton (Anna Cox). Maphaeus Vegius and his Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid. California, *Stanford University Press*, 1930. Pp. xii + 183. \$7.50.

Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé. No. 28. Juillet, 1930. Paris, *Les Belles Lettres*. 108 pp.

Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. V, Parts I and II. November, 1929, and May, 1930. Cardiff, *University of Wales Press Board*; London, *Humphrey Milford*.

Bureau of American Ethnology. Forty-fifth Annual Report. Washington, *United States Government Printing Office*, 1930. vi + 857 pp. \$2.35.

Cicero. The Speeches. Pro Quinctio—Pro Roscio Amerino—Pro Roscio Comoedo—Contra Rullum. With an English Translation by John Henry Freese. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1930. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 240.)

Drerup (Engelbert). Perioden der klassieke Philologie. Nijmegen—Utrecht, *Dekker & Van de Vegt en Van Leeuwen*, 1930. Pp. 48. 8°.

— Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart. Paderborn, *Ferdinand Schöningh Verlag*, 1930. Pp. viii + 488. 8°. 30 M.

Fitzhugh (Thomas). Triumpus—*Θραυστός*. The Indo-European or Pyrrhic Stress Accent in Antiquity. University of Virginia Bulletin of the School of Latin, Second Series, Nos. 1-2, Whole Number 11-12. Charlottesville, Virginia, *Anderson Brothers*, 1930. Pp. 207. 8°. \$5.

Frank (Tenney). Life and Literature in the Roman Republic. (Sather Classical Lectures, Volume VII.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1930. viii + 256 pp. 8°. \$3.50.

Hadas (Moses). *Sextus Pompey*. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1930. vii + 181 pp. 8°. \$2.00.

Herzfeld (E.) and Guyer (S.) *Monumenta Asiæ Minoris Antiqua*. Volume II. *Meriamlik und Korykos*. Manchester, *The Manchester University Press*, 1930. Pp. xvii + 207. 4°. (Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor.)

Hespéris. *Archives Berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des Hautes-Études Marocaines*. Tome IX. Année 1929. 1er Trimestre. Paris, *Librairie LaRose*. Pp. 144. 8°.

Howald (Ernst). *Die griechische Tragödie*. Munich, Berlin, *Verlag von R. Oldenbourg*, 1930. vi + 183 pp. Unbound 8 M.

Hunt (Arthur S.) and Johnson (John). *Two Theocritus Papyri*. London, *Egypt Exploration Society*, 1930. viii + 96 pp.

Josephus. With an English Translation by H. St. J. Thackeray. In eight volumes. Vol. IV. *Jewish Antiquities, Books I-IV*. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1930. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 242.)

Journal of Education. London, *W. Rice*, 1930. Pp. 805-856. No. 736, Vol. 62, November 1, 1930.

Kapnukajas (Christos K.) *Catull und Phalækos*. Athen, Verlag "EKATOTIKH" Blasudakis, 1930. Pp. 14.

Litman (Alexander). *Cicero's Doctrine of Nature and Man*. New York, 1930. Pp. 41. 8°.

Larsen (Thorleif) and Walker (Francis C.) *Pronunciation. A Practical Guide to American Standards*. London, New York, Toronto, *Oxford University Press*, 1930. Pp. viii + 198. \$2.50.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Volume VIII. Rome, *American Academy in Rome*, 1930. Pp. 159.

Messina (Giuseppe). *Der Ursprung der Magier und die zarathuštrische Religion*. Roma, *Pontificio Istituto Biblico*, 1930. 102 pp. 8°. 17 L.

Mnemosyne. *Bibliotheca Philologica Batava. Nova Series. Volumen quinquagesimum octavum. Pars III*. Lugduni-Batavorum, *E. J. Brill*, 1930.

Nestle (Wilhelm). *Griechische Religiosität von Homer bis Pindar und Äschylos*. Berlin, Leipzig, *Walter de Gruyter & Co.* 1930. Pp. 139.

Norsk Riksmålsordbok. Hefte I. Oslo, *H. Aschehoug & Co. Forlag*, 1930. Pp. x + 123. Kr. 1.00.

Nykl (A. R.) *A Compendium of Aljamiado Literature*. New York, 1929. 207 pp. 8°. (Extrait de la *Revue Hispanique*, tome LXXVII.)

Philological Quarterly. Volume IX. October, 1930. Number 4. Iowa City, Iowa, *University of Iowa*, 1930. Pp. 321 + 416. 8°.

Plato. *Republic*. With an English Translation by Paul Shorey. In two volumes. Vol. I. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1930. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 237.)

Popper (William). *Extracts from Abū 'L-Mahāsin Ibn Taghrī Birdī's Chronicle entitled Hawādīth ad-Duhūr*. (University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 1-163.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1930. 8°.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Vol. XL. Nos. 1 and 2 January-June, 1930. Habana, *Universidad de la Habana*. 173 pp. 8°.

Ripman (Walter). A Handbook of the Latin Language. London and Toronto, *J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd.*; New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.* Pp. vi + 804. \$3.55.

Saunders (Catharine). Vergil's Primitive Italy. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1930. viii + 226 pp. \$3.00.

Séchan (Louis). La Danse grecque antique. Paris, *E. de Boccard*, 1930. 371 pp. 50 francs.

Senart (Emile). Chāndogya-Upaniṣad. Traduite et annotée. Paris, *Les Belles Lettres*, 1930. Pp. xxxii + 142.

Sewanee Review. Vol. XXXVIII, No. 4. October-December, 1930. Sewanee, Tennessee. *The University of the South*. 8°.

Shakespeare (William). By E. K. Chambers. In two volumes. Volumes I and II. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1930. Pp. xviii + 576, and xvi + 448. 8°. \$15.00.

Sihler (Ernest G.). From Maumee to Thames and Tiber. The Life Story of an American Classical Scholar. New York, *The New York University Press*, 1930. Pp. ix + 269.

Stauffer (Donald A.) English Biography before 1700. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1930. Pp. xviii + 392. 8°.

Strabo, the Geography of. With an English Translation by Horace Leonard Jones. In eight volumes. Volume VII. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1930. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 241.)

Tannenbaum (Samuel A.) The Handwriting of the Renaissance. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1930. Pp. xii + 210. \$4.00. 8°.

Trüber (Heinrich). Die Caesurenfolgen des letzten Bearbeiters im Homer als Spuren seiner Kompositionskunst. Bonn, *Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag*, 1930. 96 pp. 8°.

Tucker (T. G.) Notes on Indo-European Etymologies. Halle (Saale), *Max Niemeyer Verlag*, 1930. 38 pp. 8°.

Ussani (Vincenzo). Storia della Letteratura Latina nelle Eta Repubblicana e Augustea. Milano, *Vallardi*, 1929. Pp. 525. Lire 55.

Walde (Alois). Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Dritte neu bearbeitete Auflage von J. B. Hofmann. 1. Lieferung. Heidelberg, *Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung*, 1930. 80 pp.

Wielands Gesammelte Schriften. Erste Abteilung: Wielands Werke. 14. u. 15. Band. Prosaische Schriften I u. II (1773-1794). Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kurrelmeyer. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1928, 1930. Pp. 460 + 210 and 817 + 247. 8°. Unbound 42 and 68 M.; bound 48 and 74 M.

Woolner (A. C.) and Sarup (Lakshman). Thirteen Trivandrum Plays Attributed to Bhāsa. Translated into English. Volume One. London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1930. \$3.00. Pp. xii.

Zuretti (C. O.) Anonymi de Arte Metallica. (Vol. VII of Catalogue des Manuscrits Alchimiques Grecs.) Bruxelles, *Maurice Lamertin*, 1930. xli + 466 pp. 8°.

INDEX TO VOLUME LI.

AΔTNATON (The Figure) in
 Greek and Latin Poetry, 32-41
 Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 304, 53-56
Persae 815, 51-53
 Two Misunderstood Passages
 in, 51-56
 Alexander (When Did) Reach
 the Hindu Kush? 22-31
 Altnordische (Die) Senkung
i : ü > ē : ö vor *kk, pp,*
 und *tt* (aus **nk, *mp, *nt*
 assimiliert), 42-50
 ANDERSON, A. R. Bucephalus
 and His Legend, 1-21
 Appropriations for the Games
 at Rome in 51 A. D., 249-50
 Authenticity (The) of Letter
 41 in the Julio-Basilian
 Correspondence, 67-69
 Authorship of the *Ciris*, 148-84
 Autumnal Fogs, *see* Lucretius.
 Basil, *see* Authenticity.
 BENNETT, HAROLD. Vergil and
 Pollio, 325-42
 BOAS, GEORGE. Review of
 Ives's translation of the
 Essays of Montaigne, 392-94
 Boethius' *De Consolatione*,
 Michael Walpole, Trans-
 lator of, 243-48
 Books Received, 89-92, 202-4, 309-12, 398-400
 Brinton's *Descensus Averno*,
 rev., 392
 Maphaeus Veginus, rev., 391-92
 Bucephalus and His Legend, 1-21
 Caesura in Latin Hexameter
 and Pentameter, *see* New
 Method.
 Campanian Topography, *see*
 Text.
 CANTER, H. V. The Figure
 AΔTNATON in Greek and
 Latin Poetry, 32-41
 Census (Roman) Statistics
 from 508 to 225 B. C., 313-24
 Chariton and his Romance
 from a Literary-Historical
 Point of View, 93-134
 Chronology of the year 238
 A. D., *see* Yale Papyrus.
Ciris, Authorship of the, 148-84
 CRONK, GERTRUDE GREENE. Lu-
 cretius and Thomson's Au-
 tumnal Fogs, 233-42

Declension, *see* Hittite.
 Disyllabic Base, *see* Vocalic
 Alternation.
 EBELING, HERMAN LOUIS. Re-
 port of Hermes, 289-97
 'Ellipsis', On the Use of the
 Term, 224-32
 Epithalamium, Tradition in
 the, 205-23
 Festus on the *Tribus Pupinia*,
 Livy and, 70-71
 Figure (The) AΔTNATON in
 Greek and Latin Poetry, 32-41
 FRANK, TENNEY. Livy and
 Festus on the *Tribus Pu-
 pinia*, 70-71
 Roman Census Statistics
 from 508 to 225 B. C., 313-24
 Reviews:
 Rand's Studies in the Script
 of Tours, 303-5
 Platner's A Topographical
 Dictionary of Ancient
 Rome, 80-81
 Games at Rome in 51 A. D.,
 Appropriations for the, 249-50
 Glotta, Report of, 191-92, 386-88
 Goldmann's Beiträge zur Lehre
 vom indogermanischen
 Charakter der etrus-
 kischen Sprache, rev., 308-9
 GRAY, LOUIS H. Vocalic Al-
 ternation in the Disyllab-
 ic Base in Indo-European,
 273-85
 GREEN, WILLIAM M. Approp-
 riations for the Games at
 Rome in 51 A. D., 249-50
 HAIGHT, ELIZABETH HAZEL-
 TON. Review of Shan-
 non's Chaucer and the Ro-
 man Poets, 81-83
 HALL, CLAYTON M. Report of
 Mnemosyne, 188-91, 382-84
 HARRY, J. E. Medea's Waxing
 Wrath, 372-77
 Two Misunderstood Passages
 in Aeschylus, 51-56
 HEIDEL, W. A. Review of
 Raeder's Oribasii Collec-
 tionum Medicorum Reli-
 quiae, 199-200
 Heidel's The Day of Yahweh,
 rev., 193-98
 Hermes, Report of, 289-97

Herrmann's *Les Masques et les Visages dans les Buccoliques de Virgile*, rev., 389

Hexameter and Pentameter, *see* New Method.

Hindu Kush, When Did Alexander Reach the? 22-31

Hittite and Indo-European Nominal Plural Declension, 251-72

Homer, *Iliad*, *see* *Iliad*.

HOUGH, JOHN N. *The Lex Lutatia and the Lex Plautia de Vi*, 135-47

HOUGHTON, WALTER E., JR. Michael Walpole, Translator of Boethius' *De Consolatione*, 243-48

HYDE, WALTER WOODBURN. Reviews:

- Jüthner's *Körperkultur im Altertum*, 395-97
- Symbolae Osloenses, 305-8
- Iliad, the Name Ποσειδάων and other Names Ending in -αων in the, 286-88
- Index, 401-4

Indo-European, *see* Vocalic Alternation and Hittite.

Ives's *The Essays of Montaigne*, rev., 392-94

Jalabert and Mouterde's Inscriptions Grecques et Latinées de la Syrie, rev., 87-89

Jensen's Menandri Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Servatae, rev., 83-84

JOHNSON, FRANKLIN P. Review of Vellay's *Les nouveaux aspects de la question de Troie*, 200-202

Jüthner's *Körperkultur im Altertum*, rev., 395-97

Julio-Basilian Correspondence, The Authenticity of Letter 41 in the, 67-69

KENT, ROLAND G. Report of Glotta, 191-92, 386-88

Review of Goldmann's Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache, 308-9

KEIDEL, GEORGE C. Report of Romania, 78-79, 384-85

Latin, Predicating Periods in, 57-61

Hexameter and Pentameter, *see* New Method.

Lex Lutatia (The) and the *Lex Plautia de Vi*, 135-47

Liechtenhan's *Anthimi De Observatione Ciborum*, rev., 198-99

Livy and Festus on the Tribus Pupinia, 70-71

Lucretius and Thomson's Autumnal Fogs, 233-42

Lutatia (Lex), *see* Lex.

MACURDY, GRACE H. The Name Ποσειδάων and other Names Ending in -αων in the Iliad, 283-88

Medea's Waxing Wrath, 372-77

Menandri (Jensen's) Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Servatae, rev., 83-84

Michael Walpole, Translator of Boethius' *De Consolatione*, 243-48

Military Anarchy, Particularism in the Roman Empire during the, 343-57

Mnemosyne, Report of, 188-91, 382-84

Mountford and Schultz's Index Rerum et Nominum in Scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati Tractatorum, rev., 390

Mouterde (René), *see* Jalabert.

Mozley's Ovid: the Art of Love and other Poems, rev., 200

MUSTARD W. P. Report of Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica, 185-88

Reviews:

- Brinton's *Descensus Averno*, 392
- Maphaeus Vegius, 391-92

Herrmann's *Les Masques et les Visages dans les Buccoliques de Virgile*, 389

Mountford and Schultz's Index Rerum et Nominum in Scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati Tractatorum, 390

Mozley's Ovid: the Art of Love and other Poems, 200

Naylor's Chateaubriand and Virgil, 392

Rostagni's *Arte Poetica di Orazio*, 390

Ussani's *Storia della Letteratura Latina nelle Età Repubblicana e Augustea*, 390-91

Name (The) Ποσειδάων and Other Names Ending in -αων in the Iliad, 286-88

Naylor's Chateaubriand and Virgil, rev., 392

New (A) Method of Investigating the Caesura in Latin Hexameter and Pentameter, 358-71

Novotný's Platonis Epistulae Commentariis Illustratae, rev., 394-95

NUTTING, H. C. On the Use of the Term 'Ellipsis', 224-32

Predicating Periods in Latin, 57-61

On the Use of the Term 'Ellipsis', 224-32

Papyrus (A Yale) and a Re-consideration of the Chronology of the Year 238 A. D., 62-66

Particularism in the Roman Empire during the Military Anarchy, 343-57

Pentameter, *see* New Method.

PERRY, B. E. Chariton and his Romance from a Literary-Historical Point of View, 93-134

PETERSEN, WALTER. Hittite and Indo-European Nominal Plural Declension, 251-72

Platner's A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome, rev., 80-81

Plautia (Lex), *see* Lex.

Pollio, Vergil and, 325-42

Ποσειδάων (The Name) and other Names Ending in -αων in the Iliad, 286-88

POST, L. A. Reviews:

- Jensen's Menandri Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Servatae, 83-84
- Novotný's Platonis Epistulae Commentariis Illustratae, 394-95

Predicating Periods in Latin, 57-61

PRENTICE, WILLIAM K. Review of Jalabert and Mouterde's Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie, 87-89

Pupinia (Tribus), *see* Tenney Frank.

Raeder's Oribasii Collectionum Medicorum Reliquiae, rev., 199-200

Rand's Studies in the Script of Tours, rev., 303-5

Reports:

- Glotta, 191-92, 386-88
- Hermes, 289-97
- Mnemosyne, 188-91, 382-84
- Revue de Philologie, 297-302
- Rheinisches Museum, 72-77
- Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica, 185-88
- Romania, 78-79, 384-85

Reviews:

- Brinton's Descensus Averno, 392
- Maphaeus Vegius and His Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid, 391-92
- Goldmann's Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache, 308-9
- Heidel's The Day of Yahweh, 193-98
- Herrmann's Les Masques et les Visages dans les Buccoliques de Virgile, 389
- Ives's translation of The Essays of Montaigne, 392-94
- Jalabert and Mouterde's Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie, 87-89
- Jensen's Menandri Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Servatae, 83-84
- Jüthner's Körperkultur im Altertum, 395-97
- Mountford and Schultz's Index Rerum et Nominum in Scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati Tractatorum, 390
- Mozley's Ovid: the Art of Love and other Poems, 200
- Naylor's Chateaubriand and Virgil, 392
- Novotný's Platonis Epistulae Commentariis Illustratae, 394-95
- Platner's A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome, 80-81
- Raeder's Oribasii Collectionum Medicorum Reliquiae, 199-200
- Rand's Studies in the Script of Tours, 303-5
- Rostagni's Arte Poetica di Orazio, 390
- Shannon's Chaucer and the Roman Poets, 81-83
- Symbolae Osloenses, 305-8
- Tavíor's A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus, 86-87

Ussani's *Storia della Letteratura Latina nelle Età Repubblicana e Augustea*, 390-91

Vellay's *Les nouveaux aspects de la question de Troie*, 200-202

Weinreich's *Studien zu Martial*, 85-86

Revue de Philologie, Report of, 297-302

Rheinisches Museum, Report of, 72-77

RIESS, ERNST. Review of Heidel's *The Day of Yahweh*, 193-98

Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica, Report of, 185-88

ROBINSON, C. A., JR. When Did Alexander Reach the Hindu Kush? 22-31

Roman Census Statistics from 508 to 225 B. C., 313-24

Roman Empire during the Military Anarchy, Particularism in the, 343-57

Romania, Report of, 78-79, 384-85

Rome in 51 A. D., Appropriations for the Games at, 249-50

Rostagni's *Arte Poetica* di Orazio, rev., 390

Saint Basil, *see* Authenticity. Schultz's Index, *see* Moundford.

Senkung (Die altnordische), *see* Altnordische.

Shannon's Chaucer and the Roman Poets, rev., 81-83

Sources (Two) for Campanian Topography, The Text of, 378-81

SPAETH, JOHN W., JR. Review of Weinreich's *Studien zu Martial*, 85-86

STEELE, R. B. Authorship of the Ciris, 148-84

STRICKLER, ROBERT PARVIN. Report of *Rheinisches Museum*, 72-77

STURTEVANT, ALBERT MOREY. Die altnordische Senkung $\ddot{\imath} : \ddot{\imath} > \ddot{\epsilon} : \ddot{\epsilon}$ vor *kk*, *pp*, und *tt* (aus **nk*, **mp*, **nt* assimiliert), 42-50

Symbolae Osloenses, rev., 305-8

Taylor's A Commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*, rev., 86-87

Text (The) of Two Sources for Campanian Topography, 378-81

Thomson's Autumnal Fogs, Lucretius and, 233-42

TOWNSEND, P. W. A Yale Papyrus and a Reconsideration of the Chronology of the Year 238 A. D., 52-66

Tradition in the Epithalamium, 205-23

Tribus Pupinia, Livy and Festus on the, 70-71

Two Misunderstood Passages in Aeschylus, 51-56

Ussani's *Storia della Letteratura Latina nelle Età Repubblicana e Augustea*, rev., 390-91

VAN BUREN, A. W. The Text of Two Sources for Campanian Topography, 378-81

VAN SICKLE, C. E. Particularism in the Roman Empire during the Military Anarchy, 343-57

Vellay's *Les nouveaux aspects de la question de Troie*, rev., 200-202

Vergil and Pollio, 325-42

Vocalic Alternation in the Disyllabic Base in Indo-European, 273-85

Walpole (Michael), Translator of Boethius' *De Consolatione*, 243-48

WAY, SISTER AGNES CLARE. The Authenticity of Letter 41 in the Julio-Basilian Correspondence, 67-69

Weinreich's *Studien zu Martial*, rev., 85-86

WHEELER, ARTHUR LESLIE. Tradition in the Epithalamium, 205-23

When Did Alexander Reach the Hindu Kush? 22-31

WHITEHEAD, PHILIP B. A New Method of Investigating the Caesura in Latin Hexameter and Pentameter, 358-71

WIGHT, CAROL. Report of *Revue de Philologie*, 297-302

Review of Taylor's A Commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*, 86-87

Yale (A) Papyrus and a Reconsideration of the Chronology of the Year 238 A. D., 62-66



THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN ARCHAEOLOGY

No. 9

Edited by DAVID M. ROBINSON

EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS

PART II

ARCHITECTURE AND SCULPTURE

With an Account of the Ruined Houses and Other Buildings, With
Chapters on Loom-weights and Lamps

By

DAVID M. ROBINSON, Ph. D., L. H. D., LL. D.

Quarto. Cloth, \$20.00

xxii + 155 pages. Three colored plates, 310 other large illustrations,
including many folded plates, plans, and a large survey

This volume gives an account of the excavations conducted in 1928 which identified the site of Olynthus destroyed by Philip of Macedon in 348 B. C. It contains chapters on the fortress and barracks, the entrance, the religious and municipal centre, the high class residential section and suburban development, the Macedonian foot, the shopping and trading district including the mint and terra-cotta factory, the outlying district on the east side, including Byzantine churches, loom-weights and lamps. The volume is profusely illustrated with original photographs and plans, here published for the first time, which explain the excavations even better than the printed text can do. Many scenes of the landscape are also reproduced. Especially interesting are the large Greek houses of the fifth and fourth century, with their characteristic rooms with raised borders and bath-tubs (one found in place on the tiled floor). These are the first important houses to be found from the great classical age of Greek culture and they fill a gap in our knowledge of city planning. The earliest pebble figure mosaic, with a procession of Nereids on dolphins, and interesting pieces of sculpture are also here published for the first time.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,

Baltimore, Md.

SELECTIONS
FROM THE
BRIEF MENTION
OF
BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

Cloth, \$4.50.

ONE of the most important undertakings of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, late Francis White Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University, was the founding and editing of the American Journal of Philology. Like other similar periodicals, this journal was open also to reviews of current philological work. It was soon found, however, that the number of the books received for review was out of all proportion to the small band of reviewers and to the limited space available for reviews. A partial remedy for the difficulty was sought in the establishment of a department of brief book notices, which, later on, was denominated Brief Mention. The mention of a book might be made the occasion for a miniature essay. The size of the essay might be enlarged so as to comprise several paragraphs. Not infrequently, the larger part, or the whole, of Brief Mention was taken up by a single review, which then was split up into sections. Scholars began to look forward with keen interest to these productions. Upon the appearance of a new number of the Journal, Brief Mention was the first thing that was turned to. In response to repeated solicitations the author finally planned the publication of a collection of Brief Mention, but, unfortunately, the completion of the task was prevented by his death. The preparation of the present volume was thereupon committed to Professor Charles William Emil Miller by Mrs. Gardiner Martin Lane, who has dedicated the book to the friends and admirers of her father in the hope that it may revive happy memories of his wit and learning.

A Biographical Sketch, including a list of the Author's publications, has been provided; and an elaborate Index, besides facilitating reference to the rich treasures of the volume, furnishes a large amount of supplementary information that is sure to be welcomed by the reader.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
Baltimore, Maryland

